HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 320 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, September 18, 2018

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, September 18, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1005)

[*Translation*]

PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the 2017-18 annual reports on the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act from the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. These documents are deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage entitled "Moving Forward—Towards A Stronger Canadian Museum Sector".

[*English*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 104 and 114 I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 68th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of committees of the House.

[*Translation*]

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 68th report later today.

[*English*]

If the House gives its consent, I move that the 68th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House today, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

PETITIONS

VISAS

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present e-petition 1576, which I sponsored and which has been certified by the clerk of petitions. The petition has been signed by 554 Canadian citizens of Sudanese origin and residents of Canada. Sudanese applicants for Canadian visas are obliged to travel all the way to Egypt, over 2,000 kilometres, Ethiopia, or the U.A.E. in order to do a 30-minute process of having their biometric fingerprints taken, which is an inconvenience for many Sudanese Canadians. The petition calls upon the Government of Canada to provide visa and immigration services including biometric fingerprinting in Khartoum, Sudan for Sudanese applicants for Canadian visas.

ELECTION OBSERVATION MISSIONS

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions that I wish to present today and table on behalf of the petitioners.

The first e-petition is number 1620 and 1,859 Canadians signed it. It calls on the Government of Canada to re-establish election observation missions throughout the world, specifically looking at making sure we are defending democracies in places like Ukraine where we have such a long history of providing observers to ensure they have free and fair elections.

● (1010)

JUSTICE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second e-petition is number 1636, with 842 petitioners who are calling on the government to expand the Magnitsky law and investigate the actions of certain Russian organizations as they have impacted Russians, the Russian economy, the way their political and civic organizations operate; as well as the way the Russians have assisted Assad in Syria and the terror we are seeing in that civil war combined with everything else that is happening in the region of Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, and the Crimean Tatars.

CEMETERY RECONSECRATION

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the final e-petition, number 1643, has over 1,391 petitioners who signed it. It is looking at the First World War internment burial grounds, a cemetery at Spirit Lake, Quebec, which sits on private land. The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to use whatever measures are necessary to provide for the archeological examination, restoration, reconsecration, and limited ongoing sites for the commemorative and religious services at the Spirit Lake internee cemetery; and to work with the Canadian First World War Internment Recognition Fund, the Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the Ukrainian Canadian Congress.

CHILDREN'S WELFARE

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce in the House a petition signed by over 3,000 petitioners from the length and breadth of British Columbia. Added to it will be several thousand other names today.

Many of the petitioners are activists for the Elizabeth Fry Society and they are seeking to end the discrimination that currently exists in federal programs for children whose parents are either homeless or incarcerated. As we know, the Canada child benefit and the homelessness partnering initiative currently do not provide the same supports for children whose parents are incarcerated or homeless. The petitioners are asking the federal government to end that discrimination and provide benefits to all children and special supports as well for children who are in unusual living situations because their parents are either homeless or incarcerated.

[*Translation*]

On behalf of these 3,000 petitioners, I am asking Parliament and the government to change a situation that disadvantages children who end up in unusual situations because their parents are either homeless or incarcerated.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today.

I am pleased to table today in the chamber my first e-petition, e-petition 1595. The petitioners believe that the current definition of "eligible residents" in the National Parks Act is outdated and limiting as it denies those demonstrating a connection and commitment to communities that lie within our national parks the right to reside in places they call home. Therefore, they are asking that the amendments be made to the act so that those raised in communities within national parks can remain connected.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my second petition says that the undersigned residents of Canada draw to the attention of the House of Commons that whereas increased concern about international trafficking in human organs removed from victims without consent has not yet led to legal prohibition on Canadians travelling abroad to acquire or receive such organs and whereas there are currently two bills before the Parliament proposing to impede the trafficking of human organs obtained without the consent or as a result of financial transaction, Bill C-350 in the House of Commons and Bill S-240 in the Senate, the undersigned urge the Parliament of Canada to move quickly on the proposed legislation so as to amend the Criminal Code and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

CANADA POST

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present.

The first is in support of postal banking. Nearly two million Canadians desperately need an alternative to payday lenders. Those predators are crippling members of our community because they charge outrageous rates for loans. There are 3,800 Canada Post outlets that already exist in rural and remote areas where there are fewer or no banks at all. These petitioners are asking Parliament to enact Motion No. 166, my motion to create a committee to study and propose a plan for postal banking under Canada Post Corporation.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is in regard to the Thames River system. As we will recall, the Conservative government stripped away environmental protections and the current government promised to bring them back, but did not. Therefore, these petitioners, who are very concerned with the health of this important river, are asking that Parliament support my bill, Bill C-355, which commits the government to prioritize the protection of the Thames River by amending the Navigation Protection Act.

The Speaker: This being the beginning of the fall session, it is a good opportunity to remind members that presenting petitions is not a time for debate but to present petitions and what petitioners are saying.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

[*Translation*]

PIPELINES

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here. I will be presenting two petitions today.

The first is about pipelines. People in my riding recognize the importance of pipelines and want the government to do more to develop pipelines in Canada.

● (1015)

[*English*]

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is with respect to my private member's bill, Bill C-350, as well as a similar bill in the Senate, Bill S-240.

The petitioners call on the government and all parliamentarians to support the speedy passage of these bills. They would make it a criminal offence for a Canadian to go abroad and receive an organ for which there was not consent. This is an effective legislative tool to combat the scourge of forced organ harvesting.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table a petition on behalf of residents from Harrington, Parksville and Qualicum Beach calling on the government to create a national strategy to combat plastic pollution in our waterways.

As we know, all of our waterways are under immediate threat from plastic pollution. The petitioners are calling for the government to establish a framework that will regulate single-use plastics, and fill the government's legislative and regulatory void that currently needs to be addressed.

This is given on the eve of the meeting of the G7 environment ministers taking place in Halifax, and just following the endorsement by the Union of British Columbia Municipalities that supports this motion and supports these petitioners.

This is an urgent matter, and we hope the Government of Canada will take immediate action to support my motion, Motion M-151.

CHILDREN'S WELFARE

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table a petition from 75 Canadians.

The petition is based on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, specifically that the interests of the child be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children.

The petitioners call on the government to take a series of actions, including recognizing the barriers in funding, including homelessness, impacting children; providing Canadian children with benefits and special allowances to all children, including those whose parents are incarcerated or addicted; and reducing interprovincial disparities that impact children and reduce their supports.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to stand today to present a petition calling on Parliament to examine the scourge of organ harvesting.

The petitioners are asking for the quick and expedient passage of Bill C-350 and Bill S-240.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in this place today to present a petition on events that have moved in the direction that the petitioners had hoped for, but the full text of their demands is important to table in the House.

This is from constituents from Saanich—Gulf Islands seeking the House to recognize the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and to, moreover, stand up for the rights of indigenous peoples to their full effect.

CHILDREN'S WELFARE

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand today and present petition number 421, which complements some of the other petitions offered earlier by the Elizabeth Fry Society.

The purpose of the petition is to make sure that no child gets left behind in Canada. It talks about homelessness and housing. It talks about services provided by government. It talks about financial supports. It is really important that these most vulnerable children are protected in a country as wealthy as Canada.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition about children's rights that was done in collaboration with the Elizabeth Fry Society. The petitioners are calling on the government to recognize that other family members may take care of children while their parents are incarcerated or homeless. Because those other family members are not eligible for family-related benefits, children miss out on that support. It is important to understand that family situations are not the same as they were back in the day. I sincerely hope the government will take action on this issue.

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues who have also tabled petitions through the amazing work of Elizabeth Fry.

This petition contains 1,000 signatures. The petitioners are calling for the government to ensure that all children benefit from special protection measures and assistance. It notes that Canada is a signatory to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and yet we have programs in place where children cannot access services and programs that they need to ensure they have the opportunity to succeed. Just because of circumstances that are out of their control, for example, homelessness impacting their parents, perhaps parents' incarceration or other situations, the result of that is that those children are not accessing services they deserve.

The petitioners call for action. I am happy to table this petition calling on the government to make that change immediately.

* * *

● (1020)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

TRANS MOUNTAIN EXPANSION PROJECT

The Speaker: I have notice of a request for an emergency debate.

The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 52, I am requesting an emergency debate on the Trans Mountain expansion project. On April 16, the House did convene an emergency debate on Trans Mountain which was granted because thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of investment were at risk, but today thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of investment in Canada and the Trans Mountain expansion itself all remain at risk.

There are two new developments that warrant Parliament convening another emergency debate. The first is the federal government's purchase of the existing Trans Mountain pipeline. Construction is stalled indefinitely, costs are increasing and Canadian taxpayers deserve answers as to how and when the expansion of the pipeline they now own will be built. The government was forced to take over the expansion because the Liberals failed to provide certainty that construction could proceed even though they promised legislation in the spring that they failed to deliver. The second development was the Federal Court of Appeal ruling that the Liberals failed to adequately consult first nations on the expansion.

Thousands of workers had jobs that they were about to start but which disappeared overnight. For almost three weeks these laid-off workers have been questioning if they should wait for work to resume or if they should find alternative employment. To date, the federal government has yet to announce a plan for how it will either fulfill the requirements of the Federal Court of Appeal and/or ensure the expansion can proceed through other means. The Liberals have delivered no plan at all.

Last week, Minister Sohi said it would be a matter of days before the plan was released—

The Speaker: Order. I think the hon. member for Lakeland is aware that we do not refer to members by their names. She is referring to a letter, but one must remember to make the adjustments when one is making a presentation in the House.

The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that.

I took the minister at his word and I did wait for the first day of the fall session for him to come forward with those details, but what happened, unfortunately, was yet another delay. Instead of coming forward with his plan to support Canada's energy sector and the livelihoods of the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who depend on it, the minister stated that it could be a week before a plan is unveiled and a month before action is taken. Canadian families cannot wait that long and for the workers affected, every day counts and every day damages Canada's reputation as a stable and predictable place for investment.

An emergency debate is needed to get the answers that Canadians deserve. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your consideration of this request.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Lakeland for her arguments and for her request for an emergency debate; however, I do not find that it meets the exigencies of the standing order.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION ACT

BILL C-79—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an agreement has been reached between a majority of the representatives of the recognized parties under the provisions of Standing Order 78(2) with respect to the second reading stage of Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. Therefore, I move:

> That, in relation to Bill C-79, An Act to implement the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at second reading stage of the Bill; and
>
> That, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

The Speaker: I would ask the hon. government House leader to indicate who is seconding her motion.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, it is seconded by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

● (1025)

The Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1105)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 881)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Badawey
Barlow
Beech
Benzen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cooper
Cuzner
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lapert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Motz
Nater
Nicholson
Obhrai
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peterson
Philpott
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Rayes
Rempel
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schiefke
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Sorenson
Stanton
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Trost
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zahid
Alhas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Anderson
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bergen
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Bonsonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Calkins
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Godin
Gould
Graham
Harder
Hébert
Hoback
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martel
McColeman
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Morrissey
Murray
Nault
Nuttall
O'Connell
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsay
Reid
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Saroya
Scheer
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga
Zimmer

256

NAYS

Members

Angus
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Davies
Dubé
Dusseault
Garrison
Hardcastle
Johns
Kwan
MacGregor
Marcil
Aubin
Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boulerice
Brosseau
Caron
Donnelly
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Duvall
Gill
Hughes
Julian
Laverdière
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)

Mathyssen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Moore	Nantel
Plamondon	Quach
Ramsey	Rankin
Sansoucy	Ste-Marie
Sitsabaiesan	Thériault
Trudel	Weir — 44

PAIRED

Members

Fortin	Ng — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

SECOND READING

The House resumed from September 17 consideration of the motion that Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-79 today, I would like to extend my best wishes to people in Edmonton Centre, who are braving the snow and looking forward to a sunny fall before the snow actually stays for the winter.

[*Translation*]

I will be sharing my time with my esteemed colleague from Rivière-des-Mille-Îles. We are beginning the debate on Bill C-79.

Our government strongly believes that the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, or CPTPP, is the best deal for Canadians and for our economy. The CPTPP is a historic new agreement between Canada and 10 other countries in the Asia-Pacific region, namely Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam.

Once it comes into effect, the CPTPP will constitute one of the largest trading blocs in the world, representing close to 500 million people and 13.5% of global GDP. The agreement will generate major economic benefits for Canada thanks to trade with countries like Japan, our fourth-largest trading partner and top source of investment from Asia, and with fast-growing economies like Malaysia and Vietnam.

● (1110)

[*English*]

Today, I would like to speak to how the CPTPP will facilitate foreign investment into Canada and provide protections for Canadians looking to invest in CPTPP markets. Investment at home and abroad is vital for the Canadian economy. Foreign investment contributes to job creation across the country. It also promotes trade by facilitating integration into global value chains, improving access to new technologies and enhancing our competitiveness.

According to economic modelling by Global Affairs Canada, the CPTPP will spur an additional 810 million dollars' worth of investment into Canada, and will encourage increased and diversified Canadian investment throughout the Asia-Pacific region. It will achieve this by creating a predictable investment environment to ensure that investors are treated in a fair and equitable manner in all CPTPP markets. If a company is going to invest its capital abroad, it needs to know that capital is safe and secure and is going to provide a return on investment.

The CPTPP will establish a comprehensive and enforceable set of investment protection provisions. It will provide new, more robust obligations on non-discriminatory treatment of CPTPP businesses and investors. These will benefit Canadian businesses through better protection from expropriation or nationalization without compensation, elimination of unfair requirements on foreign investments that favour domestic industries, and easier transfer of capital and profits to and from the host country.

To ensure that these obligations are observed by all member countries, the CPTPP also introduces and includes a fair and impartial mechanism for the resolution of disputes. Investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS, is an important component of international trade and investment agreements. With an ISDS mechanism in place, Canadian investors will have greater confidence that they will be treated in a fair and transparent manner in other CPTPP markets. It will also provide an impartial means to resolve any investment-related disputes in the event that specific obligations under the CPTPP are breached by a government. Such protections will help facilitate two-way investment by providing a transparent and predictable investment-friendly environment.

The agreement, once implemented, will encourage Canadian companies to look to fast-growing markets across the CPTPP region to grow their businesses. It will encourage investment in Canada and CPTPP countries. It will also connect Canadians with partner investors and businesses in new markets, and help our businesses further integrate into global supply chains. In doing so, it will create new opportunities and generate jobs for Canada.

It is important to emphasize that while the CPTPP's ISDS rules will help protect Canadian investors abroad and serve to attract foreign investment to Canada, the rules outlined in the CPTPP will also preserve the Government of Canada's right to regulate to achieve legitimate policy objectives. Under the CPTPP, Canada has taken certain exemptions to CPTPP obligations that allow continued policy flexibility to regulate in the public interest in sensitive areas such as health, education, indigenous affairs, culture, fisheries and certain transportation services.

[*Translation*]

Foreign investors in Canada and all the other CPTPP nations will be required to follow the same laws and regulations as Canadian investors, including laws and regulations aimed at protecting the environment and maintaining high workplace health and safety standards.

The investor-state dispute settlement mechanism, or ISDS, gives investors a way to resolve disputes without resorting to the national justice system of the host nation, but it is not a blank cheque. Damages could only be recovered if specific requirements under the agreement were violated. The ISDS tribunals would never have the power to nullify government decisions or laws. They would only be authorized to grant investors compensation for damages resulting from violations of the treaty.

By suspending certain ISDS provisions that were included in the original TPP, the CPTPP ensures that the ISDS complies with Canada's standard, balanced approach to investment obligations in free trade agreements.

● (1115)

[*English*]

This reflects the concerns that were heard from Canadians through extensive consultations, and I am proud to say that the CPTPP gets ISDS right.

To reiterate, CPTPP will not prevent Canada from protecting the environment or maintaining or enhancing labour, health, and safety standards. In short, it will allow us to continue promoting the values that Canadians cherish, which are the values that make us Canadian.

I would like to highlight for residents of Edmonton Centre, and for all Albertans, that this CPTPP is one of the most comprehensive trade agreements that our country will enter into. It comprises 11 countries: Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. Once approved, it will open up a market of an additional 500 million consumers, resulting in 40% of the world economy being able to trade with us when we add in CETA, NAFTA and South Korea. This demonstrates our commitment to opening up new markets. It is an important agreement because it will eliminate over 95% of tariff lines, representing over 98% of total trade and over 99% of Canada's exports.

I want to highlight the importance of this for Alberta industry and Edmonton companies. Let us take a look at the agriculture provision.

When CPTPP enters into force, more than three-quarters of agriculture and agri-food products will benefit from immediate duty-free treatment, with tariffs on many other products to be phased out gradually. This means new market access opportunities for Canadian pork, beef, pulses, fruit and vegetables, malt, grains, cereals, animal feeds, maple syrup, wines and spirits, and then processed grain and pulse products as well. All of these products hail from my province of Alberta.

Let us take a look at industrial goods. Under the agreement, 100% of tariffs on industrial goods and consumer products will be eliminated. The majority of Canadian industrial goods exported to CPTPP countries will be duty-free immediately upon the entry into force of the agreement, with most remaining tariffs on industrial goods to be eliminated within 10 years. That is also good for Alberta and Edmonton businesses.

On forestry and value-added wood products, CPTPP will eliminate tariffs on all Canadian exports of forestry and value-added wood products. Many will enter into force immediately, while others will be phased out over 15 years.

With regard to services, our economy is diversifying in Alberta. Many companies in my own city of Edmonton will love the provision in CPTPP that will provide more secure access through greater transparency and predictability in the dynamic CPTPP region.

I would like us to think about professional sectors like engineering, architecture and those related to environment and mining. My riding of Edmonton Centre alone is headquarters to the seventh-largest engineering and design firm in the world, Stantec, and one of the world's largest construction companies, Poole Construction Limited, known as PCL. This is the kind of free trade deal that allows these companies, as well as small and medium-sized enterprises, to continue expanding around the world.

In terms of government procurement, this agreement will provide more transparency and opportunity for companies in my hometown of Morinville, in St. Albert and in Edmonton to compete on the global stage. It is what we promised Canadians during the campaign. It is what our government has been doing. It is what we will continue to do: opening up markets, creating jobs, and growing the Canadian economy.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question about what is not in this deal. This deal looks like it was maybe drafted in the 1990s. There is no mention of climate action and no mention of sustainable development. It contains very dated environmental measures. It completely derogates from the strong measures in the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation. There is no council of ministers, and no right of the public to petition on a complaint of failed enforcement. It fails to recognize the rights in Canadian law for citizens to file environmental actions.

The member and his government always say the environment can go hand in glove with economic development and trade. Why then is it accepting downgraded measures that were put in place decades ago in the NAFTA agreement?

Mr. Randy Boissonnault: Mr. Speaker, as our government has said and will continue to say, the environment and the economy go hand in hand. That is why we have worked hard with member nations in this agreement and in others to ensure high environmental standards. In the case of CPTPP, as I mentioned, there are exemptions in Canada for culture, labour and environmental considerations.

As it pertains to this agreement, this is about opening up markets to half a billion of the world's consumers and making sure Canadian businesses can compete on the global stage.

We take our environmental responsibilities very seriously here at home and abroad, and we will continue to do so.

● (1123)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we settle back into our roles here in the House, I thank my colleague for his pointed and passionate speech, which is reminiscent of the speeches he made over the past three years.

[*English*]

I would like my colleague to expand on the CPTTP. Canada is getting $4.8 billion in GDP per year from it. This is enormous. He knows, as I do, that Canada is one of the richest countries in the world when it comes to natural resources. This is a major agreement that would benefit Canadians from coast to coast to coast. I would like him to share how he sees the different industries in Canada benefiting from the agreement and how the middle class would benefit from jobs, opportunities and access to markets.

Mr. Randy Boissonnault: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his passion, which has not diminished over three years. It is an important opportunity to mention that all of the provisions of the CPTPP would benefit small and medium-sized enterprises. We know they represent well over 95% of businesses and job creation in the country.

The fish and seafood provision alone would eliminate 100% of tariffs on Canadian fish and seafood products. We know what that means to fishers coast to coast to coast who are trying to export their goods around the world. CPTPP is good for them and middle-class families.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we wanted to have an emergency session in July on Bill C-79, but the government refused our proposal. Why?

Mr. Randy Boissonnault: Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple: we are debating the CPTPP now. It is good for Canadians, for the middle class, for economic growth and for job creation. We are doing the work today. That is what we promised and what we are going to do.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today as the proud member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

The trans-Pacific partnership is a very important agreement. As the member for Edmonton Centre said earlier, Bill C-79 is historically significant. It opens up a new market of 500 million consumers. This will help SMEs and create jobs for the middle class. It is something that is very important to me.

For two and a half years I was a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade, where we studied this agreement. We visited this country from coast to coast, meeting people in many towns and cities in every province. We wanted to give everyone a chance to have their say on this very important matter. We also met with many representatives from the labour movement, civil society, business associations and chambers of commerce. We were also the first committee to have open-mic meetings so that everyone would have a chance to speak, and we certainly took their comments into consideration.

Let's think about it: eleven countries, namely Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam managed to come together to reach such an important agreement. We are opening up access to these markets and that is very important. We already have a free trade agreement with Europe, we will have one with Asia-Pacific countries, and we are currently negotiating to open up markets. With all these free trade agreements, Canada will be well positioned to grow the middle class and create good jobs for our SMEs.

I am very pleased to talk about the CPTPP and the positive impact it will have on businesses in Canada's industrial and manufacturing sectors.

My riding is a suburb north of Montreal with a huge number of SMEs and businesses that work in the aerospace, agrifood, and food processing sectors. These sectors produce a wide range of products across the country from cars to medical equipment, metals, chemical products and plastics. They are key components of our country's economy that employ 1.7 million highly qualified Canadians full time and account for nearly 11% of Canada's GDP.

Our government firmly believes that the CPTPP is an ideal agreement for Canadians and for our economy. This is a top-notch trade agreement that will help increase Canadian exports.

● (1125)

[*English*]

As a cornerstone of our government's comprehensive effort to enhance Canada's engagement with the dynamic, fast growing and increasingly influential Asian markets, it is an important part of our commitment to diversify trade, grow our economy and strengthen our country's middle class. Trade and investment flows between Canada and Asian economies have increased significantly since the turn of the century. From 2014 to 2016, Canada's exports of industrial and manufactured goods to CPTPP countries accounted for an annual average of $22.4 billion.

By eliminating nearly 100% of tariffs on manufactured goods, including some tariffs that are as high as 85%, and creating mechanisms to address non-tariff barriers to trade, the CPTPP would create opportunities for world-class Canadian businesses to increase their sales. Once the agreement enters into force, it will enable Canadian exporters to access diverse and internationally integrated value chains. On day one of the agreement's coming into force, there will be no tariffs on over 87% of industrial tariff lines covering Canadian exports to CPTPP markets worth an annual average of $19.5 billion from 2015 to 2017.

What does this mean for our industries? Allow me to provide a few examples.

For Canada's multi-billion dollar chemicals and plastics industry, the CPTPP will provide opportunities for companies, from those in Ontario, the hub of Canada's plastics industry, to cutting-edge chemical facilities in Alberta. With improved market access from the elimination of tariffs of as high as 50%, this industry will increase its annual average of $1.1 billion in exports to CPTPP markets.

With respect to metals and minerals, a sector contributing nearly 600,000 jobs across Canada and exporting $5 billion in goods to CPTPP markets, the agreement will result in the elimination of all tariffs, some as high as 50%. As a result, highly sought-after Canadian aluminum, steel, iron, petroleum products and precious metals will become even more competitive in such markets as Japan, Australia, Malaysia and Vietnam.

Canada's information and communication technologies sector, critical to major urban centres across Canada, is also well positioned under the CPTPP to meet growing needs within established and developing markets in the Asia-Pacific. In addition to eliminating tariffs, the agreement will protect companies from having to divulge their proprietary information in order to sell their products in CPTPP markets.

[*Translation*]

Our government listened to what Canadians had to say about the auto industry and made their concerns a priority. As part of the CPTPP negotiations, Canada obtained bilateral side letters from Australia and Malaysia in order to establish more liberal rules of origin, which would allow our automobile manufacturers to benefit from preferential tariff treatment on those markets without having to change their existing production models. We also reached bilateral agreements with Japan and Malaysia regarding standards and regulations in the automobile industry, a key demand of industry stakeholders.

Those are just a few examples of the industries that could benefit from the CPTPP. By making Canada's industrial and manufacturing exports more competitive and by cutting the red tape that hinders access to dynamic, growing markets, the CPTPP will give Canadian businesses significant opportunities to increase their profits and create new quality jobs for the middle class.

● (1130)

[*English*]

Beyond tariff reduction, another aspect of the CPTPP that stands to benefit Canadian companies in these sectors is in the area of intellectual property. The CPTPP's provisions on intellectual property cover virtually all areas of trade and IP, including copyright, patents, trademarks, geographical indication, industrial designs, domain names, and enforcement. Most importantly, the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights will help protect Canadian innovation and investment as our businesses trade abroad. For many Canadian businesses, one of the most significant barriers to trade in some markets is uncertainty over the protection of intellectual property, including whether their intellectual property rights will be respected and enforced.

[*Translation*]

As a result, innovative Canadian businesses will be better able to market their products on the established, rapidly expanding Asian markets.

Beyond tariff reduction and intellectual property rules, the CPTPP also addresses the costly non-tariff obstacles preventing Canadian companies from entering foreign markets. All CPTPP members have committed to eliminating restrictive red tape in sectors such as cosmetics, medical instruments, pharmaceuticals, and ICTs, and this will give Canadian manufacturing exporters greater certainty and predictability with the competitive advantages they have gained.

The CPTPP marks a very important step in the history of trade in Canada. This agreement will be instrumental in diversifying our markets and promoting economic prosperity here at home. By establishing an effective, transparent, rule-based trade system with one of the most dynamic and fastest growing regions in the world, the CPTPP will open up new possibilities for exporters in our industrial and manufacturing sectors.

I also want to point out that we secured a cultural exception, which is very important for Quebec and for official languages.

[*English*]

Mr. Fin Donnelly (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, studies show that up to 60,000 jobs could be lost due to the CPTPP.

The economic analysis conducted by the government concludes that the CPTPP would generate economic gains for Canada of about $4.2 billion over 22 years. The $4.2 billion represents the same level of economic output in terms of GDP, gross domestic product, that Canada generates in one day.

Could the member tell us why the government insists on pushing through this deal with such limited gains, a deal that poses grave dangers to labour standards, the environment, manufacturing, and supply-managed sectors?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question.

I was always a bit surprised when I was a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade. We often asked the New Democrats if there was any free trade deal they supported. We have created 500,000 jobs since we took office three years ago in 2015. That is a lot. We have not seen this sort of employment situation for 40 years. I am still at a bit of a loss.

Is there any free trade agreement in the world that the NDP supports?

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the exciting things about this trade agreement is that it strengthens our relationship with a key partner in the Pacific, Japan.

Japan has a great need for a secure supply of energy. It imports the vast majority of its energy resources, much of it coming from the Middle East through the South China Sea. In particular, strengthening our energy relationship with Japan presents a great opportunity for deepening our economic and other relationship with Japan.

So much of the potential of this trade agreement to increase our commercial ties with Asia depends on our ability to get our resources to market. Specifically, we have seen, over the summer, the failure of the government when it comes to actually proceeding with a pipeline it had promised and that would have allowed us to do better at accessing Asian markets for our energy resources.

Could the member explain to me why the government decided to buy the pipeline with no plan to actually get it built? Given that we are in support of this trade agreement, what is the government's plan to actually proceed with the critical infrastructure for getting our energy resources to the west coast that would allow us to benefit from some of these opportunities?

● (1135)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question. He talked about Japan and so I will too.

One thing that often came up when the international trade committee was examining the trans-Pacific partnership was that Japan was so happy to know that we would have an agreement on fish and seafood coming from the Maritimes and the Pacific. The Japanese are pleased to know that they will be able to buy these products without tariffs. There will be an increase in exports of lobster, fish, snow crab and oysters, foods that people in Japan love to eat.

I want to assure my colleagues that we are going to do everything in our power to ensure that our natural resources reach Asia.

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we know, the Liberal government is very big on consultation. It does consultation, and at the end of the process, if the consultation is not in agreement with the government's position, it will just go ahead and do whatever it wants anyway. We saw this with electoral reform.

In this instance, the Liberal government promised it would do consultation. Not only did it not do meaningful consultation, it passed the buck over to the committee. The committee did some work on this and 95% of the submissions to the committee were against this deal. Why is the government pushing ahead, given that the limited consultation done by the committee indicated the public did not support the deal?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, we were the first committee to travel across Canada and hold open-mic meetings. Yes, we listened to Canadians. Yes, Canadians are happy. We have created 500,000 jobs since 2015. Opening up the market in Asia, which represents 500 million consumers, and the market in Europe as we did is unprecedented. It goes without saying that opening these markets will result in more middle-class jobs. In my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, SMEs will benefit on the export side.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Before we continue, I want to remind everyone that when someone is asking or answering a question, it is their time. I know the summer has gone by. We were wonderful in June when we left, but we seem to have forgotten the rules. Again, I want to remind everyone that when someone is answering or asking a question, it is not appropriate to heckle across the aisle.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has finally seen the light and understands how important it is to quickly ratify the CPTPP.

At long last, Canada may soon ratify the agreement reached in 2015. We hope this will happen quickly. Members will recall that the CPTPP was one of the Prime Minister's first missteps on the international stage. I would like to quote a few articles, including this one:

[*English*]

"Prime Minister a no-show at meeting."

[*Translation*]

I would like to give the House a quick reminder of what happened.

[*English*]

"Ten leaders from countries remaining in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) were left "red-faced" by Canadian Prime Minister...when he did not turn up at a TPP-11 leaders meeting."

[*Translation*]

Here is some of the reaction:

[*English*]

Shinzo Abe announced that "the signing was off" because the Prime Minister would not attend.

Steve Ciobo called it a 'disappointing development'.

Some ministers said that the Prime Minister got "cold feet" because of looming elections in Quebec.

[*Translation*]

What motivates this party's actions? Not the national economy. The answer is political trends and partisanship. Why do I think that? Because when the other countries reached an agreement last spring, we could have made short work of Bill C-79 here in the House. The government could have introduced Bill C-79 back in May, and we could have started working on it then. Had that been the case, we would already have ratified the agreement, and we would have been one of the first six countries to do so. However, the government sat on the bill until the last week before the break, at which point it was too late to start working on it.

The official opposition moved two motions for the unanimous consent of the House to get on with studying the bill quickly and adopting it as written. Obviously, that did not happen. Now the government says it is going to act fast. I just do not get it. This has all been such a disappointment. Anyway, if the past is any indication, we know that they do not always walk the talk.

I have a lot more to say about this, but I will not have enough time because I am sharing my time with the member for Sherwood Park —Fort Saskatchewan. He has a lot to say about Bill C-79 too.

Our leader, the Leader of the Opposition, sent a letter to the Prime Minister this summer, asking him to act more quickly so that we would not miss the opportunity to be among the first six countries to sign the CPTPP.

I would now like to read a few excerpts from the letter our leader sent to the Prime Minister. I think it is important that Canadians know where we stood at the time and why we were asking him to act quickly.

> These actions by the United States threaten the jobs and livelihoods of thousands of Canadians. This is even more worrying given the U.S. government's repeated threats to impose 25% tariffs on the auto sector. On this file, Canada's Conservatives' most pressing priority is to protect Canadian jobs and industry by having tariffs removed from Canadian steel and aluminium and by stopping new tariffs from being imposed.

The same is true today. He also wrote:

> Conservatives have always supported diversifying our trading relationships around the world, which is why the previous Conservative government had the foresight to conclude free trade negotiations and investment agreements with 53 countries, including the countries of the original trans-Pacific partnership and the 28 countries of CETA, which concluded in 2014.

Our leader continued:

> ...it is even more urgent that we act to expand and diversify our trading relationships.

That is why he called on the Prime Minister to:

> ...request that the Speaker recall the House of Commons pursuant to Standing Order 28(3) as soon as possible this summer [exceptionally] to debate and pass Bill C-79, the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership implementation act.

The leader cited the Peterson Institute for International Economics which:

> ...estimated that the original TPP, which was negotiated and concluded by the previous Conservative government, would boost Canadian income by $20 billion over the next decade.

This request was flatly rejected by the government. We do not understand why.

● (1140)

We were ready to get to work and spend part of the summer ensuring that this bill is passed as soon as possible. Why it is so important for us to be among the first six countries? It is simple. It is because after the first six signatures, after six countries enshrine the agreement, the CPTPP comes into effect within 60 days. If we are not there during that time, all the good agreements for exporting and importing with those countries will already have been concluded with the first six signatory countries. Canada will be left with crumbs.

The last one to arrive at the table in a large family gets whatever is left and often that is nothing at all. That is why we think it is absolutely urgent and necessary to ratify the CPTPP quickly.

We will obviously work with the government to adopt the CPTPP as quickly as possible, because it is important to our industry and to farmers. The Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance held two press conferences. They held a press conference and send out a press release to explain why we must adopt the CPTPP as quickly as possible. According to research commissioned by the Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance, this trade pact could increase Canadian agri-food exports by nearly $2 billion annually for a variety of agriculture products including beef, pork, grains, canola, pulses, soybeans, barley, sugar, and processed foods.

That is the reality. We are talking about the economy. Canadian jobs will be in jeopardy if we do not move fast enough. We are deeply disappointed that the government took too long to finally grasp how important it was to sign the CPTPP as quickly as possible.

I hope the government finally gets it, for the sake of the people who produce these agriculture products, including beef, pork, grains, canola, pulses, soybeans, barley, sugar and processed foods.

I would like to move on to another sector covered by the agreement that is raising some serious concerns. I am referring to the supply management sector. The agreement requires Canada to make concessions on supply management. Under the old agreement, the previous Conservative government foresaw that there would be consequences for producers in supply-managed sectors. That was why we instituted a 10-year compensation plan.

The compensation plan provided up to $4 billion for producers in supply-managed sectors. We created it because we felt it was important to recognize that even though we had succeeded in negotiating a global economic agreement that was good for Canada, we had had to sacrifice part of the supply management quota, and producers deserved to be compensated accordingly. We allocated $4 billion, including $450 million for facility upgrades.

The response of the current government has been to offer no compensation program whatsoever. No wonder people are worried today. No announcements have been made on this subject, and no empathy has been shown towards producers in supply-managed sectors, even though they have willingly sacrificed part of their quotas for the good of the Canadian economy.

The government created a little $350-million program to modernize farms and support processors. The Conservatives' plan allocated $450 million, in addition to more than $3 billion to protect quotas and offset the losses that supply-managed farmers could experience once the TPP is implemented.

In short, the official opposition will support ratifying the CPTPP as quickly as possible, because this agreement is important to our economy. Once again, I hope that the Liberal government will not screw this up come signing time, and I hope that everyone will be there. I hope that we do not end up being a laughingstock on the world stage.

● (1145)

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. He is always very enthusiastic, and I appreciate that. I want to welcome him back. This is so important.

I do want to point out that just three countries have ratified the agreement so far. Six countries must do so before the agreement can come into force. We are moving quickly right now, so Canada should make the list and not end up seventh among the four, five, or six major countries. I would like to hear the member's thoughts on the middle class and small businesses.

Does he think that Canadians, across the country, small businesses, and the middle class will benefit from this agreement that will bring in $4.2 billion in its first year?

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, we hope that this agreement is ratified as quickly as possible. We hope that the other countries do not move more quickly than we do, but there are no guarantees of that. Who can guarantee that three other countries will not sign and ratify the CPTPP next week. That is the problem. We had the opportunity to beat them to the punch. Canada has the second-largest economy of the CPTPP countries. Does it seem right that we are among the last of the first group of six to ratify it? We are going to benefit a lot more from this agreement than many other countries, and yet the Liberals waited until the last minute. They put our economy at risk for purely political reasons.

● (1150)

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the CPTPP which is being moved forward by the government would result in some 60,000 Canadian jobs being lost. Given that this is the case, why would the Conservative members support this deal going forward?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, I do not how the member is getting those numbers from an injection of over $4 billion dollars into the Canadian economy. I think the government must be looking at international trade agreements in a very partisan way to be saying things and coming up with numbers like that. I think that exports will help to stabilize our agricultural industry. Right now, there are a lot of problems on the global agricultural market. This will help to maintain jobs and create new ones. I can guarantee that.

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague on his speech. I know how hard the member for Mégantic—L'Érable has worked in the agriculture sector as the shadow minister for agriculture and agri-food.

I would like the member to explain what he thinks makes the CPTPP so imperative right now as the Liberal government has bungled and failed in our relationships with other countries which have been trusted trading partners in the past. India, Japan and Italy are now pulling back from accessing the Canadian market which is costing us some very vital export markets for our producers. Now, because of how the Liberals have bungled NAFTA, our main trading partner, the United States, is also at risk. Losing that market could be costly to the Canadian agriculture sector.

With everything that is going around and how mismanaged our relationships have been with our trusted trading partners, why is CPTPP that much more important right now?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague. The CPTPP is very important, and the Liberal government must take our international trade relations with all of our partners seriously.

Just look at the Prime Minister's trip to India back at the beginning of the year. Shortly after that trip to India, we got hit with harsh tariffs. The Prime Minister was there, but he did not broach the subject with the Indian prime minister. They did not talk about it at all, and as a result, our pulse exports to India are down $300 million this year. When he was there, the Prime Minister could have tried to deal with the situation before it got this bad. The fact that the Prime Minister skips out on signing ceremonies and visits countries but does not talk about major agricultural issues with our partners is causing problems, like the one we are having with India right now.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House to debate Bill C-79, the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership implementation act. I would like to thank the member for Abbotsford for the excellent work he did on this agreement during his tenure as the international trade minister under the previous Conservative government.

I would like to begin by underscoring how important this bill is to our farming communities. According to the Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance, passing this legislation could boost the value of Canada's agri-food exports by $1.84 billion. This agreement will open up a whole new market where Canadian farmers will be able to sell their products.

In addition, given the uncertainty over NAFTA negotiations, it is even more crucial that we pass this bill so that we can further diversify our trade. When the United States starts imposing tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum, Canada needs to find new markets for its products. When Canada loses access to a market and to thousands of jobs, it just makes sense to find a new market where we can sell the same products.

Furthermore, the countries that Canada will get access to through this agreement have a combined GDP of about $13 billion. These countries include Japan, which has the third-largest economy after the United States and China. This represents a market worth about three-quarters of the U.S. market. The CPTPP is an incredible opportunity to diversify Canada's trade and improve Canadians' economic well-being.

When we look at all the benefits that the CPTPP will have for Canada once we pass this bill, it is hard to understand why the Liberals chose to ignore the opposition leader's request to recall the House of Commons to pass Bill C-79. The Conservative Party leader made that request because the agreement will only come into force once it has been fully ratified by six different countries. Mexico, Japan and Singapore had already ratified it by the time the request was made, so only three other countries needed to sign on for the agreement to come into force.

If the Liberals had recalled the House to pass this bill during the summer, as we requested, Canada could have secured the earliest possible access to the new markets. Instead, they decided to take a chance that three other countries would ratify the agreement, costing Canada thousands of jobs. With NAFTA, the government sat on its hands while the other countries negotiated a free trade agreement, and it almost let the same thing happen with the CPTPP.

The Liberals had no reason not to recall the House to pass this bill. The fact that they ignored this request shows that they do not take Canadians' economic well-being seriously. In fact, this Liberal government seems almost determined to make life harder and harder for Canadians.

● (1155)

First, the Liberals are imposing a carbon tax, but they do not want to say how much it will cost Canadians.

This tax will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It will only make Canadians' lives more difficult by encouraging investors to invest outside Canada, in countries with different environmental regulations.

Second, the Liberals are incapable of building pipelines like Trans Mountain and energy east. These pipelines would have brought new jobs to Canada and benefited all Canadians.

Finally, the Liberals refused to recall the House to guarantee that Canadians in every sector would have access to a larger market.

These three examples show that the Liberals are not fighting for the middle class and those seeking to join it. Instead, they show that the Liberals do not take Canadian jobs seriously. It seems that every time the Liberals announce a new policy, it discourages investment in Canada and stifles the creation of new jobs.

In closing, I would like to explain why I support the bill and free trade.

In general, free trade is a good thing. It certainly has played a role in major changes around the world. For example, free trade has resulted in the rate of extreme poverty dropping from 44% to less than 10% since the early 1980s. Free trade has increased the life expectancy at birth from 53 years in 1960 to 70 today. There are fewer wars around the world because of free trade. When countries trade, they become more dependent on one another economically. When countries trade, it is no longer profitable to be at war. It is much more advantageous to keep the peace so that we can reap the mutual benefits of trade between countries.

These are the many reasons why the previous Conservative government signed free trade agreements with many countries. It did so with Panama, South Korea, Honduras and many others. That is why the Conservative government negotiated the TPP and the free trade agreement with the European Union. On this side of the House, we support free trade for practical reasons and on principle.

Free trade also helps promote freedom. I have always advocated for human rights and freedom in my work here and elsewhere. Free trade is an essential form of freedom. Free trade implies that people have the right to buy and sell across borders as they see fit.

For all these reasons, I will vote in favour of this bill. Once again, I want to point out that my Conservative colleagues, like the member for Abbotsford and the former prime minister, worked hard to ensure Canada's prosperity.

● (1200)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague across the way for his ability to communicate in French. It was done quite well.

I appreciate the fact that the Conservative Party has recognized the value in supporting the legislation and has assisted us in moving forward by supporting the time allocation motion. The whole trade file has been a very important for this government, virtually from day one. We saw a lot of the work from the previous administration that was finalized and signed off by this government at the economic union. That was very helpful.

We recognize that trade negotiations and discussions evolve. However, it is really important for us to recognize that the biggest benefactor of this is the middle class, the economy and those aspiring to become a part of the middle class as we try to expand the markets. These trade agreements are all about that, providing opportunities and a potential for ongoing expansion of our economy.

Could my colleague across the way provide his thoughts on how important it is that we pass the legislation relatively quickly, given we would like to be one of the first six countries to sign on, which is an important aspect of the legislation in itself?

● (1205)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, it is great that my Liberal colleagues agree with the Conservative Party and that they support the work we did as a government. I agree that it would be ideal if we could move this bill forward. However, it was not good when the government decided to deny our leader's request to hold a special sitting in the summer. We could have gotten started on this bill before September. Unfortunately, the government chose not to. Now, we must certainly move this bill forward very quickly.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the CPTPP includes investor-state provisions that will allow investors to sue Canada for regulating in the public interest on issues like health and the environment. Why does the member support an agreement with such harmful provisions? Maybe he could elaborate on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, the issue of the provisions the hon. member refers to is quite clear. If we have a free trade agreement, there needs to be a mechanism to ensure that measures are followed. That is why, for example, in the NAFTA negotiations, we are calling for the same thing from the United States, namely to protect the impartial mechanisms that are used to assess requests from companies, individuals and governments. I do not understand what makes the NDP think we can have free trade agreements without a mechanism to ensure that measures are followed. In the meantime, it is clear that the NDP does not support any free trade agreement.

[*English*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I want to congratulate my colleague for his excellent speech in French, 100% French. This is a good inspiration for all of us.

[*Translation*]

I have a simple question: what made the hon. member decide to deliver his speech in French?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. I spent four weeks in Quebec this summer to improve my French. I am glad to have francophone colleagues who can help me practice my French. I think it is important for all members to be able to present their arguments in both official languages and to speak in such a way that we can all understand each other.

[*English*]

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government strongly believes that the comprehensive and progressive trans-Pacific partnership agreement, or CPTPP, will help increase and diversify Canada's trade and investment in the rapidly growing Asia-Pacific markets and improve Canadians' economic prosperity. At the same time, the agreement will ensure that the benefits of trade are widely shared, in particular by making it easy for small and medium-sized enterprises, or SMEs, to take advantage of the opportunities it offers.

Exports are essential for the health and vitality of Canadian businesses and Canadian SMEs play a key role in increasing trade and economic growth in Canada. Indeed, SMEs are the backbone of the Canadian economy. They represent more than 99% of all businesses, 90% of all private sector jobs and 10.7 million workers and they generate nearly 40% of Canada's gross domestic product.

I forgot to mention, Mr. Speaker, that I will be sharing my time with the member for Winnipeg Centre.

Only 11% of Canadian SMEs benefit from foreign markets, however, and our government is committed to helping increase that. Exports are vital to the growth of Canada's economy. That is why our government will help small businesses expand into new markets abroad by promoting exports through the negotiation and implementation of the free trade agreements, such as the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, CETA, between Canada and EU; and now the CPTPP.

The CPTPP will enable Canadian SMEs to enter the dynamic Asia-Pacific market through agreements that simplify the export process and increase SME participation in global supply chains. This agreement will strengthen our economic ties with some of our current free trade partners, such as Chile, Mexico, and Peru, while providing preferential market access to seven new free trade partners: Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and Brunei.

In addition, the CPTPP will eliminate tariffs and improve market access for Canadian companies, including SMEs. Upon implementation, 86% of signatory countries' tariffs will be instantly eliminated. This will apply to Canadian exports to CPTPP countries, with an average value of $28.3 billion per year between 2015 and 2017. Once the agreement is fully implemented, signatory countries would eliminate 99% of their tariffs. This will apply to exports to CPTPP countries that average $32 billion per year between 2015 and 2017. This increased market access will make our SMEs more competitive and position them for success. It will also create opportunities for Canadian SMEs to diversify their exports at a time when this is extremely important.

The agreement provides for enhanced market access agreements for our financial services and service sectors and a comprehensive set of investment protection provisions based on a strong dispute resolution mechanism for investments. These provisions will greatly benefit SMEs as they are disproportionately impacted by non-tariff barriers.

In addition, the CPTPP will be a first in Canada in terms of free trade agreements in that it contains a chapter that specifically guarantees that small and medium-sized enterprises will be able to take advantage of the opportunities it creates. This separate chapter highlights the importance of SMEs, which are the backbone of our economy and an engine of economic growth.

These provisions will ensure that our entrepreneurs and small businesses have access to information tailored to their needs, making it easy for Canadian companies to explore and navigate their way around CPTPP markets and prepare for their successful business ventures.

Through the efforts of the committee, as well as collaborative mechanisms, CPTPP signatories will be able to share best practices on how to support their businesses and to co-operate through seminars, workshops, and other capacity-building activities aimed at helping their businesses seize the opportunities created by the agreement.

The CPTPP will increase market opportunities for Canadian companies of all sizes and in all sectors and regions of the country. In the coming months, we will reach out to small and medium-sized enterprises across the country to ensure they have the knowledge and tools they need to take advantage of this historic agreement. At the same time, we will work to help Canadian SMEs to grow, expand their activities, increase their productivity and be innovative and export oriented so they can prosper and create good jobs for the middle class.

● (1210)

Asia is important to Canada and to our small and medium-sized enterprises. Indeed, that region's contribution to the global economy continues to grow and Asia's importance as a destination for Canadian exports has more than doubled.

The CPTPP is a cornerstone of our government's commitment to trade diversification. It will enable Canadian businesses to trade and invest in this dynamic and rapidly-growing region. Since Asia is a highly integrated and adaptable region, the benefits of CPTPP go well beyond access to new markets. This agreement will provide Canadian companies of all sizes with opportunities to enter into various regionally integrated value chains that are global in scope.

Ambitious agreements with high standards, such as the CPTPP, will help to strengthen the rules-based international system and its solid institutions, promoting global value chains and ensuring a level playing field that maximizes the benefits of trade for everyone.

By responsibly expanding our economic ties with our Asian partners, we are delivering on our promise to create economic growth opportunities that will benefit Canada's middle class. This agreement will create opportunities for Canadian entrepreneurs and small and medium-sized enterprises to expand their activities, prosper and create good jobs for the middle class. We are here to help Canadians, to help them move forward, to grow and succeed abroad, while creating an environment conducive to sustainable and lasting growth for all.

● (1215)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like ask the hon. member the same question I previously asked the member for Edmonton Centre.

Both the Conservatives and Liberals deeply supported the NAFTA agreement. One of the remarkable things about the NAFTA agreement were the two side agreements, one on labour and one on the environment. The side agreement on the environment, the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation, had very strong provisions. It established a council of environment ministers of all the parties to the agreement and extended a lot of rights and opportunities to the public of all of the signatory parties to be engaged, including filing petitions for action on failed enforcement.

Could the member respond to this? Why has her government decided to significantly downgrade environmental protections, yet claims to put environment on par with economic development and trade?

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, it is worth underscoring that in our consultations with Canadians, a strong dispute mechanism was seen to be very important, and that is in place. However, lifting off NAFTA, there has never been a more important time to diversify our markets. Certainly, we and the opposition are in major agreement on that. It is the member opposite who does not seem to fully appreciate the importance of the CPTPP and this opportunity to diversify our markets.

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a fairly simple question. In my riding, in the town of Creston and area, dairy farming is a very important part of the agriculture industry and the economy. It seems like with every trade deal that gets signed dairy is sacrificed. I would like to hear from my colleague across the floor why it is okay to continually sacrifice our dairy farmers in these trade agreements.

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, this is the party of supply management. We firmly support and will continue to defend supply management.

With regard to the CETA agreement, I was part of the cheese quotas and the compensation out of regard for supply management. There is no doubt in my mind we will continue to defend it strongly.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to the parliamentary secretary's speech about the CPTPP, an incredible agreement that will open a market of 500 million people.

I would like my hon. colleague to talk about the spinoffs that this agreement will have in her riding, particularly for SMEs, but also for women entrepreneurs. That is a very important aspect.

[*English*]

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for women entrepreneurs is a key aspect of the CPTPP. While I had the honour of serving as the parliamentary secretary to the minister of international trade, I spent quite a bit of time in countries like Malaysia, Vietnam, Brunei and Singapore, convening round tables of women entrepreneurs. That has been very well received. Canada is seen as a leader in supporting women in small business, and certainly the CPTPP is evidence of that.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member has not talked about first nations and how they are affected by the CPTPP.

The member's party recently indicated its support for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, yet the government has failed to consult indigenous peoples on the CPTPP.

Does the member not believe that consultation with, and consent by, indigenous peoples is critical for reconciliation, and that there should be a chapter and provision in this deal that ensures that is reflected?

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, there is no relationship that is more important to the government than with indigenous peoples, Métis, and Inuit, first nations.

This is an opportunity to discuss the new position of the ombudsperson for corporate social responsibility, because it takes into account the rights of indigenous peoples, particularly in the countries of the CPTPP and globally. Furthermore, with regard to culture, it is very important to our country to defend our unique and inclusive culture.

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,

[*Member spoke in Cree*]

I am pleased to have the opportunity today to talk about the significant benefits of the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, or CPTPP. I want to talk specifically about the Canadian fish and seafood sector.

This agreement is extremely important not only for Canada, but also for Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. It is also important for us to have access to those markets.

The Canadian fish and seafood sector is vital to our economy and essential to maintaining a solid employment base in a diverse economy. We are fortunate to have a very prosperous fish and seafood sector. It contributes more than $2 billion to Canada's GDP annually and provides more than 76,000 jobs for Canadians.

Regionally, this sector offers economic opportunities to countless communities both on the coasts and even in Canada's interior.

[*English*]

In the west, employment in British Columbia's fish and seafood industry accounts for approximately 12% of all jobs in this sector across Canada. In the Maritimes, more than two-thirds of the entire Canadian fish and seafood sector is employed across the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labrador. Fishing is also important in Quebec and our northern communities in Yukon and Nunavut, while freshwater fishing is notably important for Manitoba.

Commercial fishing is a valued industry in Manitoba. For over 100 years, Manitobans have been commercially fishing and harvesting fish. The majority of production comes from Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba, but seven smaller lakes in the south and northern Manitoba are also fished. The resource is managed through the use of quotas, the mesh size of gillnets, by season, and by regulation of the number of licenced fishers. The management tools allow fish populations and the industry to remain viable. They also ensure that resources are shared equitably on all the lakes with not only non-indigenous people but also treaty indigenous people and Métis people. Since almost all of the commercial production is sold out of the country, the $30 million in annual sales represents a significant and important contribution to the livelihoods of Manitoba fishing families.

In Manitoba, it is also important to maintain high quality. Manitoba is the only jurisdiction in the western hemisphere with an eco certified freshwater market. We have achieved a Marine Stewardship Council certification and are very proud of that. Now, 85% of the total fish harvested in Manitoba is exported to other markets. There are 3,155 licenced fishermen in Manitoba and 83% of these are of indigenous descent. They help support many indigenous communities and help provide a good livelihood and support for many families. There are 46 communities and first nations who are involved in this fishery and 294 resulting direct jobs that have improved people's quality of life from their involvement in the fishery. Many Canadians' jobs and livelihood depend on this sector, which is the economic mainstay of approximately 1,500 communities in rural and coastal Canada.

I will now focus on why free trade agreements and the CPTPP in particular are necessary to sustain and develop Canada's fish and seafood industry.

Simply put, Canada's fisheries and aquaculture industries produce high-quality, sustainably sourced fish and seafood that help feed the world. The Canadian fish and seafood industry is export-oriented and depends on international markets. In Asia, increased demand from the region's growing middle class represents enormous potential for Canadian exporters of high-quality fish and seafood products.

Once the CPTPP enters into force, it will provide Canadian fish and seafood exporters with preferential access to one of the largest trading blocs in the world, representing close to 500 million people and 13.5% of global GDP. Altogether, Canadians exported an annual average of $732 million in fish and seafood products to CPTPP markets from 2015 to 2017.

● (1225)

[*Translation*]

Japan is one CPTPP market where Canadian companies can expect huge growth opportunities. Japan is the third-largest economy in the world and imports more than 60% of its food on a caloric basis, so its demand for imported foods is high.

Right now, Canada's ability to compete in the CPTPP markets is hindered by the high tariffs imposed on fish and seafood products like frozen snow crab, lobster, salmon, fish fillets, and oysters. These tariffs can range from 3.5% to 34% in CPTPP countries like Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, and New Zealand.

When the agreement enters into force, more than 90% of the fish and seafood tariff lines will immediately become duty-free for Canadian exports, which had an average annual value of $647 million between 2015 and 2017. The remaining 10% will be phased out within 15 years.

[*English*]

For example, close to 66% of Japan's fish and seafood tariff lines will be eliminated upon entry into force of the agreement, providing preferential market access for Canada's premium fish and seafood products, such as lobster, crab, shrimp, salmon, herring roe, sea urchins and halibut. Eighty-three per cent of Vietnam's fish and seafood tariff lines will become duty free upon entry into force, while all Canadian fish and seafood exports to Malaysia will become duty free on day one. Enhanced market access for Canadian companies through the CPTPP will create the conditions for increased exports and will contribute to the vitality of the sector and its greater long-term prosperity.

Additional rules for streamlined customs and administration procedures, as well as enhanced regulatory co-operation, will also help Canadian exporters and suppliers save time and money at the borders of CPTPP countries. With increased access and less red tape, these products will gain an advantage over those of competitors from countries that do not have preferential access to CPTPP markets. At the same time, each CPTPP party will maintain the right to take measures necessary for food safety and to protect against risks to animal or plant life or health while helping to ensure that market access gains are not undermined by unnecessary trade restrictions.

The CPTPP's clear rules on developing, adopting and implementing measures for food safety and the protection of animals, plant life and health ensure that any measures will be science based, risk based and transparent. Ultimately, these provisions will create a predictable training environment for CPTPP members, giving manufacturers and exporters a leg up in prospective markets. Consultations with the fish and seafood industry have been overwhelmingly positive. The feedback from Canadians making a living in this sector is that the fish and seafood industry stands to benefit from the elimination of tariffs, and they are excited about this agreement.

The CPTPP also includes an environment chapter that addresses a number of important global environmental challenges with binding commitments from CPTPP members to, among other things, combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and promote sustainable fisheries management, including through obligations to prohibit subsidies that negatively affect fish stocks. The environment chapter also establishes a framework for co-operation in areas of mutual interest. This includes, for example, working together to mitigate the impacts of climate change, promote and conserve biodiversity, address the illegal wildlife trade, combat invasive alien species and promote sustainable fisheries practices. By maintaining policy flexibility in areas, including fisheries and aquaculture, Canada will ensure the sustainability of our valuable fish resources now and into the future.

By increasing and diversifying Canada's presence in major seafood markets in the Asia-Pacific region, this trade agreement has the potential to provide significant benefits to thousands of Canadians. By providing duty-free access to this huge market, CPTPP will help put more of our country's world-class fish and seafood products on more dinner plates and tables around the world. The fish and seafood sector contributes greatly to Canada's economic prosperity and standard of living, especially our coastal regions, but also to indigenous communities in the interior like Manitoba, and is vital to long-term growth.

I am fully committed to supporting this sector and to ensuring that it remains a vibrant and integral part of Canada's culture and economy. That is why I encourage all members of the House to vote in support of this bill, to allow us to implement the CPTPP in order for Canadians, including indigenous fishermen and all fishermen in Manitoba, to reap its benefits.

● (1230)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we know that Canada has lost billions of dollars in legal fees and payouts due to the investor-state provisions in NAFTA, so I wonder why the government is continuing to push trade deals that entrench these provisions that will continue to undermine our sovereignty and ability to regulate in the best public interest.

We know that indigenous communities have raised these concerns repeatedly. The member's party recently indicated its support for UNDRIP and the government still has failed to consult indigenous peoples on the CPTPP. Why is the member supportive of this trade agreement when the government has not consulted indigenous peoples? We know how critical consultation is for reconciliation and building trust with those communities, as well as ensuring that they have the sovereignty to protect themselves.

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette: Mr. Speaker, I have been involved in many consultations working with first nations communities in Manitoba talking about the importance of the fisheries. For instance, with respect to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, the Conservative government in Manitoba actually removed Manitoba from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act and essentially caused a bit of chaos in the freshwater lake fisheries in Manitoba, which impacts indigenous fishers. Eighty-three per cent of the fishers in Manitoba are indigenous.

I spent a long time talking to the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and other groups, like the Manitoba Metis Federation, as well as other colleagues in the Manitoba caucus. We discussed how these fishers could eventually buy the corporation so they could be the owners not only of this resource but of how they market the fish and where that fish eventually goes. They could be real true partners in what actually happens. This is part and parcel of the things I am working on in Manitoba.

Obviously, there are a few other questions and ideas the member raised related to chapter 19 of NAFTA, as well as other things, like how we resolve disputes. These are very important considerations. However, if we do not have those agreements and someone puts tariffs on our products, how do we then resolve that question? Do we start a trade war or do we have a mechanism where we could actually have an agreement and come to some sort of conclusion about unfair trade practices which may be on both sides?

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on his speech on this second day of our return to Parliament. His support for this very important deal is clear.

We are looking at GDP increasing by $4.2 billion in the first year. We are talking about Canadians having access to half a billion people who can purchase products. We are also talking about the Canadian economy and the small business community and the middle-class being able to import various products tariff-free. I would like my colleague to share his opinion on small business and the middle class and how his community and surrounding areas would benefit from this very important deal that would improve access to products and markets for our products, because we are the richest country in the world in natural resources.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook for his question.

I heard a Conservative MP from Edmonton speak French for the first time. He gave a big speech in French. I also want to mention that I am a French-speaking indigenous Canadian. Yes, we do exist in Canada. I am very proud to be able to speak the language of Molière.

It is important to really grow our GDP. Manitoba's fisheries are suffering because some fish are not considered economically viable in certain markets. There may be a solution to this problem. For example, there is a Vietnamese dish called fish floss that is popular in Asia. The fish being thrown back into the lakes in Manitoba could be used to produce a food that Asians would enjoy. We could even develop our markets and sell products that people want in Asia, Vietnam, or elsewhere.

● (1235)

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be back in the House, to see my colleagues again, and particularly to participate in the debate on Bill C-79. I would like to inform you that I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Yesterday, we began the debate about the ratification of the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. Yesterday, we spent five and a half hours debating this important bill. This morning, a time allocation motion was moved. The Liberal Party, the government, worked with the Conservative Party, the official opposition, to fast-track Bill C-79.

It is disappointing not to have time to rise to express the concerns of the people we represent concerning an important bill like the ratification of this agreement. It is frustrating and disappointing. I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise to express Canadians' fears and concerns about this bill.

I would first like to set the stage by providing a bit of context. The Prime Minister made a statement during the election campaign. On October 5, 2015, he said:

> The government has an obligation to be open and honest about the negotiation process, and immediately share all the details of any agreement. Canadians deserve to know what impacts this agreement will have on different industries across our country. The federal government must keep its word and defend Canadian interests during the TPP's ratification process—which includes defending supply management, our auto sector, and Canadian manufacturers across the country.

That was in 2015. It is now 2018, and it is clear that the Prime Minister has kept neither his word, nor his promise.

The Standing Committee on International Trade held consultations, and I want to thank our critic who worked very hard in committee. We are proud of what she has been able to accomplish. These consultations were not very accessible to members of the public wanting to participate. The public did not get much warning that consultations on the TPP were being held. People did not have much time to prepare, get to, and participate in the consultations. Members of the public had one hour to make submissions and give testimony. In Montreal, 19 members of the public opposed the agreement. Three individuals in Quebec City opposed the agreement. The committee received more than 8,000 submissions from Canadians.

We had a very hard time getting them translated and reviewing all of the submissions properly. There was no comprehensive consultation like the one the Prime Minister promised in 2015. The committee is supposed to be independent, but its consultations were strongly influenced by the government.

I remind members that the Standing Committee on International Trade held dozens of meetings, heard from more than 400 witnesses, and received written comments from more than 60,000 Canadians, 95% of whom opposed the bill and the ratification of the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership.

I rise today to speak on behalf of the people of Berthier—Maskinongé, whom I am proud to represent. I had the honour of sitting on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food since 2012. In January I took on new responsibilities, but I follow the committee's work closely.

All of the agreements that the government has signed since I entered politics in 2011 have chipped away at our supply management system. Every agreement signed gives greater access to our dairy, poultry, turkey or egg markets.

● (1240)

Every agreement we sign opens up more of our market. The Conservative government said it would support and defend our supply management system, but what it actually did was negotiate agreements that allowed greater access to our market. The Liberal Party, with its majority, is doing the same thing. Despite the Liberals' insistence that they support our supply management system, they are continuing to poke holes in it.

Canadians are entitled to a government that respects the will of the people and does not negotiate agreements behind closed doors. Experts tell us that ratifying the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership will cost between 60,000 and 80,000 jobs in Canada because of concessions affecting the auto sector. How disturbing that the government is so willing to jeopardize those jobs.

Concessions in the CPTPP are keeping dairy, egg and poultry producers up at night and could cost 26,000 jobs in Quebec alone. Dairy producers say that giving up 3.25% of the Canadian market will likely cost them about $250 million in annual income. Should our supply management system disappear entirely, the poultry sector would lose 60,000 to 80,000 jobs. That does not even take into account concessions in the Canada-EU agreement.

All the agreements Canada has signed recently represent a 15% increase in access to our supply-managed markets. The government kept saying that it would protect our supply management system, but it has never said that it will fully protect it, so naturally, farmers have some fears and concerns.

We also have to think about timing. Right now we are debating ratifying the trans-Pacific partnership, and yet Canada is still negotiating with the United States. Several experts and groups have urged us to be cautious.

By going ahead with this and supporting the trans-Pacific partnership, we will be giving other countries greater access to our supply-managed market. This could send Mr. Trump and our American friends a clear message: we are prepared to grant them even more access to our market.

These market losses will cause Canada's GDP to drop by between $4.6 billion and $6.3 billion. The study also found that dismantling our supply management system would provide no real benefit to Canadian consumers.

According to the Éleveurs de volailles du Québec, across the poultry industry the implementation of the trans-Pacific partnership will result in the loss of more than 2,200 jobs and cut $150 billion from Canada's GDP.

It is true that our supply management system was created by the Liberals, but here it is being greatly weakened once more. We are witnessing its death by a thousand cuts. We are weakening our system to the point that it will no longer be worthwhile to keep it in place.

The government is telling us that there is nothing to worry about and that there will be a compensation plan for producers, but producers are not interested. They do not want to hear about compensation. Canadian producers want the federal government to do its job. Promises need to be kept. We hope the government will hold its own in the NAFTA renegotiation. That said, up to now, it has not been able to stand up for producers.

We could talk about other problems with the trans-Pacific partnership. For example, there is the auto sector. Many people work in the auto and parts sector.

● (1245)

These people and a number of unions are strongly opposed to the CPTPP because it will not do much to help them. It is still causing a lot of uncertainty. Less stringent rules of origin expose Canada to competition with Japanese vehicles that have a lot more components from countries that are not members of the TPP, such as China, Thailand, and Indonesia. However, Canada is maintaining its commitment to gradually eliminate its tariffs in the auto sector over a short period of five years.

There are a number of reasons why we do not support the TPP. It jeopardizes jobs. The government is telling us that it is protecting jobs and will create jobs for the middle class, but it is putting these jobs and these workers in jeopardy.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her speech.

She talked about her colleague who is a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade. I had the opportunity to serve with that member on the committee. We also went to Asia to meet with people in Malaysia and Singapore who are part of the TPP. These people are thrilled with the agreement. The member mentioned job losses. Since 2015, we have created 500,000 jobs. The member talked about the consultations that we held. There were open mic consultations across Canada. We heard from representatives of unions, civil society, and the business community. The Canada brand is seen in a very positive light everywhere we went. I hope that the member's colleague told her about what we heard.

One thing that was mentioned that will have a particular impact on the member since her riding is in Quebec is that we managed to get a letter containing the cultural exemption under the TPP. It is very important for the economies of Quebec and Canada to be able to promote culture.

I would like to hear what my colleague has to say about that.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

The Standing Committee on International Trade held consultations across Canada. From what I understand, public notices were issued and there was not much time to announce the consultations. It took some time, and not everyone was able to attend in person. The committee received about 8,000 briefs. They had not been translated, so we did not necessarily get to read every single brief that was submitted to the committee.

With regard to culture, many experts expressed concerns about the trans-Pacific partnership because the cultural exemption it contained was the weakest such provision to have been negotiated in a free trade agreement. It was not something Canada could be proud of. It was not worth bragging about, because it was not a step forward.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé for her speech.

I would like to remind her of the motion that was unanimously adopted by the House on February 7, 2018:

> That this House calls on the government to ensure that there is no breach in supply management as part of the new Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Bill C-79 proposes 3.25% for the dairy market, 2.3% for eggs, and 2.1% for poultry, which would supposedly be protected. I would like to point out that we, the legislators, the elected officials, are the bosses. We are the ones giving orders to the government. We adopted a unanimous motion. I recall that the two ministers of trade were present in the House and supported the motion. Now we get a bill that contains a major breach in supply management. In my view, the government is acting like a poor student with a bad attitude.

I would like to hear my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé's thoughts on this.

● (1250)

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Joliette for his question.

The House voted unanimously in favour of the motion to ensure that any agreements we sign do not open a breach in our supply management system. Unfortunately, unanimous motions do not force the government to take action. That is sad because each new agreement we sign chips away at supply management.

In 2014, I even moved a similar motion calling for financial support and demanding that the government fully protect supply management in the Canada-Europe agreement, but we all know how that turned out.

Benoit Legault represents dairy farmers in the Outaouais-Laurentides region. This is what he had to say:

> All countries subsidize their agricultural sectors to ensure food sovereignty. However, our dairy farmers have never needed subsidies because production is tightly controlled. There is no surplus, prices do not go down, and there is no need to subsidize our dairy farmers. Then the government came along with compensation...

He was talking about the investment plan, which never materialized. These farmers do not want subsidies. They do not want money. They just want the government to do its job, keep its promises, and protect our borders like it said it would.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to stand in the House and speak to this very important issue. I had the privilege of being the New Democratic Party official opposition critic on international trade for four years in the last Parliament.

Of course, the agreement that is the subject of discussion today that was known then as the TPP or trans-Pacific partnership, now renamed the comprehensive and progressive trans-Pacific partnership, was very much in the public domain at that time. I followed the details as that agreement was being negotiated fairly carefully at that time. Essentially, my concern comes down to a number of basic points.

First of all, New Democrats have long been concerned by the secrecy surrounding the TPP and the CPTPP negotiations. Despite direct promises by the Prime Minister during the last election to be transparent on trade deals, the Liberals continue to give Canadians vague updates and mixed messages. Today we faced the shameful action by the government that brought in time allocation to limit debate on this very important subject. The previous government did this almost 100 times and the present Liberal government seems to be trying to match it. That shuts down democratic debate. It prevents us from speaking our minds and representing our constituents, which we were elected to come here to do. I think it is deplorable and it ought to be condemned.

Second, we have to recall that the trade committee held dozens of sessions, heard from more than 400 witnesses and received written comments from more than 60,000 Canadians. The overwhelming consensus was that 95% of those people, those good people who took the time to make their views known, were against this deal. Experts also point out that Canada under the CPTPP would lose 58,000 jobs due to concessions that would damage our automobile industry and our supply management system. I will explore that in a few minutes.

This deal also contains troubling provisions on foreign control of Canadian businesses, rights to privacy and intellectual property. This agreement contains extremely weak labour and environment standards. I would say they are virtually absent. The so-called side letters are almost toothless, not only because they are not in the main agreement but because of the language contained in them.

The New Democrats have, for decades now, been strong proponents of fair trade and fair trade deals that seek to raise the labour standards, improve environmental protection, protect our public services and culture, and increase jobs in the Canadian economy.

I want to stop for a moment because I have heard, unfortunately, from the Liberal side of the House, some words that I think typify a very unfortunate approach to politics. We saw this in the last Conservative government under then Prime Minister Harper where if one was not in agreement with the government, then one was subject to a very simplified wedge politics approach that completely misrepresented one's position. It was repeated endlessly, so for instance if one did not stand with the Conservatives' tough-on-crime legislation, somehow one was on the side of child molesters. That approach to politics is deplorable in this House. I think Canadians reject it. We reject it. It does not do anything to advance informed political debate.

I am hearing the same thing from Liberals in this debate that, because we are not in favour of this agreement or are doing our job as opposition by critiquing this agreement, we are opposed to trade. That is absurd and it is nonsense, yet the Liberals keep saying that. Every Canadian understands the importance of trade. Every Canadian wants Canada to be a positive trading nation. That does not mean that we will sign any piece of paper put in front of us. That does not mean that we will be in favour of any agreement, no matter how many jobs it costs Canada or how harmful it is to the Canadian economy.

I want to state for the record that New Democrats are proud supporters of trade. We are strong supporters of Canadian champions and we want to build a strong trading nation in Canada that protects our environment, that supports labour and human rights and that also supports Canadian champions on the world scene.

● (1255)

The only major change that appears to be positive about this whole deal is that the Liberals put the word "progressive" in the title. This is a cynical and very transparent ploy that progressive Canadians will not accept. There is nothing progressive about this deal.

I want to talk for a few minutes about why this agreement is troubling and will start with the auto sector.

The auto sector in this country is extremely important. Canada is the 10th largest vehicle producer in the world. The auto sector is the largest manufacturing sector in Canada. Over 120,000 employees are directly employed in the auto and auto parts sector and it is responsible for about $100 billion in factory sales and related economic activity.

What will the CPTPP do? Industry and labour groups in the auto and auto parts sectors that will be most affected by this and have been carefully monitoring this agreement over the last number of years are strongly opposed to it.

The auto industry is already in the crosshairs of the NAFTA negotiation and facing punitive U.S. tariffs. The industry does not believe the Liberals' claims that the CPTPP will open up markets in the Asia-Pacific, particularly Japan. In fact, anybody who watches auto industry patterns and trends will realize that by reducing tariffs in this country, we are going to see a flood of automobiles and automotive parts coming in from jurisdictions, and not the other way around. It will only increase the auto trade imbalance and further de-harmonize the Canada-U.S. auto industry. Why? Let us look at the rules of origin.

Under the CPTPP, in order for a vehicle made in a TPP country to come into Canada tariff-free, 35% to 45% of it has to be made within a TPP country. Imagine that. If a car manufacturer sets up, say, in Vietnam or Malaysia, in order for one of its cars to come in tariff-free, only 35% to 45% of it has to be made in Vietnam or Malaysia. The rest of the car can be made outside of either of those countries in low wage jurisdictions like Bangladesh or India, or any other low wage jurisdiction that has no environmental standards and very poor labour and employment standards. Even if 35% to 45% is made in the low wage jurisdictions of Malaysia or Vietnam, 55% to 65% of that vehicle, the rest of it, will be made in an even lower wage jurisdiction.

How on earth are major vehicle manufacturers centred in Canada that pay good wages, that pay workers' compensation benefits, that pay for health and welfare benefits, and that pay good taxes or support social programs in this country supposed to compete with that? Yet the Liberals expect us to believe that under this deal we are going to be making vehicles here and will be sending them to Malaysia. If anyone believes that, we have a bridge for sale.

I want to talk about supply management. Supply management is made up of three pillars: price controls, production controls, and import controls. The Liberals continually say that they stand up for supply management in every trade deal, but what they do not tell Canadians is that in every trade deal they have signed, from CETA to the CPTPP, and probably with NAFTA today, they are chipping away at the import controls and letting each one of those great deals let more and more dairy products come in, 3% for Europe, and another 3.5% for the TPP countries. Who knows what we are going to give Donald Trump?

That means that as they sit here and pretend to support supply management, the Liberals are eroding or sawing off that third pillar of supply management. Eventually it will be 15%, 20%, 25%, 40%, 50% of import controls and by that time supply management will have been killed from within.

We saw what happened with Brexit in England. We saw the election of Donald Trump. What happened? Workers around the world have perceived that over the last 30 or 40 years under so-called globalization business has achieved everything it wanted, such as lower labour costs, deregulation, and liberalized trade so that global capital could move around the world. What has happened? The benefits of that have not been shared equally.

That is why the British and American working class have rebelled against neo-Liberal trade deals, all of which have only done one thing: increased GDP for the top 1% to 10%, while 90% of the rest of us end up having poor jobs while we watch our manufacturing sector get hollowed out and good middle-class, family sustaining jobs sent to low wage jurisdictions.

● (1300)

That is what has happened under the Liberals, it is what happened under the Conservatives, and the New Democrats are the only ones who will stand in the House and fight for Canadian jobs and a strong Canadian economy here at home for everybody. We will stand against these lousy trade deals every time they are put before us in the House. That is what the CPTPP is, a lousy deal, and we will continue to fight against it until we can stop this agreement.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague.

Whenever the New Democrats talk about free trade agreements, the same question always comes to mind: has there ever been one they supported? For two and a half years, I was a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade, and they never supported a single one. Some 500,000 jobs have been created for the middle class in Canada since 2015.

Earlier the member mentioned auto parts. Consultations on the trans-Pacific partnership were held in every town and city in the country. We met with representatives of automakers and auto parts manufacturers associations, not only from the U.S., but also from Japan and Korea. Our government also listened to what Canadian auto sector workers had to say, and we made their concerns a priority. As part of the negotiations, Canada signed bilateral side letters with Australia and Malaysia, but there is also Japan.

What do all these jobs mean for the middle class in my colleague's riding? I hope he knows what this means.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I heard this the other day in the House and I am going to repeat it, that the only thing consistent about the Liberals on trade is their inconsistency. I was carefully following the debate in 1988 when the Liberal Party opposed the free trade agreement with the United States. In 1993, I saw the Liberal Party campaign against NAFTA and say that it would pull out of it if it were elected. It was elected, but what happened? As is often the case with the Liberals, they campaigned from the left and governed from the right. They suddenly forgot that promise. Then they were for NAFTA. In terms of inconsistency, for the Liberals I guess it just depends which way the wind is blowing, and then they will determine their trade policy.

I forgive my hon. colleague for not knowing this as I do not think she was present in the last parliament, but the NDP has supported two agreements. We supported an agreement with South Korea and an agreement with Jordan. We supported those agreements because we analyzed them and determined that the countries we would be trading with would be of benefit to Canada. We read the agreements and made sure that overall they would be of benefit to this country. The Liberals should try to do that sometime.

Finally, on auto and auto parts, if we go back and look at the facts, ever since we signed NAFTA, the auto plants in Canada have gone down and the auto plants in Mexico have gone up almost exactly in proportion. We have lost manufacturing jobs. Everybody who watches knows; it is common sense. If one signs an agreement with a country that pays one-third the wages we do and does not have any of the social programs we do, capital will likely go to that jurisdiction for it to operate its manufacturing plants there and then just ship the goods back to us. That is exactly what was done, and that is what this deal would do too.

● (1305)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have seen New Democrats perform inside the House of Commons for many years at the provincial level, and one of the things that really strikes me is the fact that they are somewhat consistent. When the member talks about trade and trade agreements, for all intents and purposes they do not support trade agreements, period. They might cite one or two, but when it comes to actually doing the assessment, we know that they do not do one. This very piece of legislation is a good example of it. They opposed this agreement before the details of it were even known. Once they received the actual agreement, then they justified their position. Their position was known before the agreement. Everyone knew that. Thomas Mulcair was going around saying that they opposed the agreement, yet he had no idea what was in it.

The NDP does not support trade or trade agreements, yet Canada's economy and middle class are very dependent on these. Trade realizes real tangible jobs, jobs that Canadians want. When will the NDP take a position in support of Canadian jobs? I was at a Canada Goose factory last week, which is exporting and creating hundreds of jobs. There are over 500,000 jobs—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to me how the member always confuses volume with logic. I cannot compete with logic like that.

He said that the NDP does not support trade agreements, but that we might support a couple. Of course we support trade agreements. I have cited two that we support. Once again he has repeated that old canard that the NDP does not support trade. I have defied him to find one comment ever made by any New Democrat in the history of our party that indicates we do not support trade, yet he repeats his claim here. That is just misleading Canadians.

Here is an interesting thing. Speaking of suppositions, the present Minister of Foreign Affairs, when she was the critic for international trade, said this when the CETA text finally came out. Members can read it in the newspapers. She said she was looking forward to finally seeing the deal that she has been supporting all along. That is what the Liberals said about CETA. They supported CETA before they actually knew what was in it. Maybe that is why my hon. colleague has such projection on this issue, because what he is accusing the NDP of is really what the Liberals are guilty of.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I should advise the House that there have been more than five hours of debate on this motion during this first round. Consequently, all subsequent interventions shall be limited to ten minutes for speeches and five minutes for questions and comments.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Joliette.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing Bill C-79, a bill to implement the new incarnation of the TPP without the United States.

The Bloc Québécois is sincerely and seriously concerned about supply management and the breaches that are included in this new version of the agreement. The government gave up 3.25% of the dairy market, 2.3% of the egg market, and 2.1% of the poultry market.

The Liberals and Conservatives, who boast about being the great defenders of our farmers and supply management, just voted in favour of time allocation in order to pass this bill quickly. Last spring, they tried to have a motion adopted unanimously to pass the bill immediately. Obviously, we were there and voted against the motion.

There is quite a disconnect between what they say and what they do. They say they want to defend supply management in its entirety, without any breaches. Now that there is a tangible case in front of them, they are changing their tune and cannot pass this new version of the TPP, with all its breaches, soon enough. That does not add up. There is a major lack of credibility here.

On that note, I would remind the House that whenever there is a by-election, big promises are made. During the by-election in Lac-Saint-Jean, the Prime Minister said, "We will not make any concessions when it comes to supply management."

He said this about the TPP on October 19, 2017, in Saint-Félicien, as reported by the Journal de Montréal. I was there too, and I heard it. We were happy at the time, but we now know how much his word is worth.

Just before the last election, on October 4, 2015, the Prime Minister gave an interview to Radio-Canada, which is still available online, in which he said that the Liberal government would not make any concessions on supply management in the TPP. There was even a unanimous motion passed on February 7, 2018. The motion stated:

> That the House call on the government to ensure that there is no breach in supply management as part of the new Trans-Pacific Partnership.

My colleague from Mirabel moved this motion, which passed unanimously. The two Liberal international trade ministers were in the House, and they agreed.

I remind members that we, as legislators and elected officials, are the government's boss. We asked the government, including all of the Liberals and all of the Conservatives, to ensure that there was no breach in supply management in the new version of the trans-Pacific partnership. We ended up with a significant breach nonetheless. I repeat that his word and his promise are worthless in my eyes.

I would remind members that we are talking about 3.25% for milk, 2.3% for eggs, and 2.1% for poultry. These are all supposedly protected by a quota system that is very costly for farmers. In total, to have a protected market, we are talking about approximately $33 billion in quotas, including $20 billion just for the dairy sector. That is not peanuts. We should respect that.

This is the current explanation for the breach. The Americans wanted concessions with respect to supply management. As they no longer want to be part of the new TPP, they are being enticed with concessions to come back to the table. So what do President Donald Trump and the Americans do? They say they do not want the new TPP, but they want these types of concessions in NAFTA renegotiations. Since we made them in the TPP, we can make them to the Americans, as well. That makes a breach in two agreements for our farmers, who are paying for absolutely nothing.

I will draw a parallel to NAFTA. On June 7, the Prime Minister stated in a Radio-Canada article that if Donald Trump wants to attack supply management, there would be no NAFTA, that they would not sign NAFTA. Given that the government's credibility and the worth of its word have been seriously tainted, there may be some doubt about that.

On September 26 of last year, we were proactive and passed a unanimous motion:

> That the House reiterate its desire to fully preserve supply management during the NAFTA renegotiations.

There is an election campaign underway in Quebec. All party leaders are asking that supply management remain intact in NAFTA. However, it seems that this is not as important given the comments made by Simon Beauchemin, the Prime Minister's advisor in NAFTA renegotiations, who wrote an open letter in La Presse calling for the abolition of supply management.

● (1310)

On that topic, last winter I asked him if he wanted to abolish supply management and how he planned to reimburse the $33 billion worth of quota once supply management is abolished. Farmers are borrowing from financial institutions to cover that. All he did was chortle at me before taking off.

I would remind the House that back when the majority of seats in Quebec were held by Bloc Québécois members, supply management was respected, and those sectors were automatically excluded from the 10 trade agreements signed by Canada, including NAFTA.

At the time, Quebec had more of a voice and Canada listened. Since 2011, that has no longer been the case. Consider the Canada-EU agreement. The bargaining chip that Canada gave up was a new breach for the dairy and cheese sector.

The Harper government had not only promised but even budgeted $4.3 billion in compensation for our dairy producers. The Liberals came to power and tore up that agreement, and instead created a mini program worth $250 million. The first part was gone in a matter of minutes. It was heavily criticized and not suited to our farmers. That is unacceptable. Our farmers were used as a bargaining chip in the Canada-EU agreement. The same thing happened with the TPP and now the CPTPP.

The government has not announced any compensation for our farmers. Once again, farmers are being used as bargaining chips. We are worried about the NAFTA renegotiation because the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs have changed their tune. We get silence, or they talk around the issue. We have real concerns that there could be another breach in supply management.

This is in addition to all of the tricks, which I consider illegal, that American producers use to try to break into our market and that take an awful lot of time to address. I am talking about milk proteins, diafiltered milk, and misuse of the duty deferral program. There is also the spent fowl scandal, or the distributors that throw in a couple packets of sauce to bring in chicken wings and bypass supply management. Another example is how pizza kits are used bring in grated cheese, and I could go on.

Up until 2011, the government made its position clear to other countries. If they wanted us to make changes to supply management, they would have to eliminate their subsidies and other protectionist mechanisms. That used to be a prerequisite for negotiation, but not anymore. The government gave an inch, and now it is open season.

A C.D. Howe Institute study showed that, in its first year, the TPP's impact on the GDP would be 0.01%. That is negligible. Any benefit will go mainly to Ontario and the west. Quebec is too far from the Pacific nations to benefit much at all. Nevertheless, the things Canada gave up in order to join the partnership are things that matter to Quebec. That is deplorable and unacceptable.

The supply management system works. The United States has a number of protected sectors such as cotton and sugar, but also dairy, eggs and poultry, same as here. All of the agreements that have been signed include very high tariffs to protect domestic markets. Most, if not all, industrialized nations have mechanisms to protect agriculture. Agriculture is an important sector, one vital to any country's national security and to feeding its people.

Apparently Canada's government is the only one prepared to sell out its farmers time after time. That is unacceptable.

We do not want to see the kinds of megafarms that have been popping up in the United States in recent years. Some of those farms have 10,000 cows. Megafarms account for 30% of milk production. Here, farms typically have about 50 cows. I am talking about a family farm land use model. If we did things here like they do in the United States, my entire riding would have a single producer. That is unacceptable, and we want nothing to do with it. An American magazine called Quartz reported that the suicide rate on American family farms is one a week.

● (1315)

That is not what we want, so we will vote against this agreement because of the major breach it creates in supply management.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague's speech. He represents a riding in Quebec. My riding is also in Quebec, in a suburb north of Montreal.

As far as the TPP is concerned, I had the opportunity to sit on the Standing Committee on International Trade for two and a half years and we held consultations across the country. We heard from labour unions, civil society, auto parts manufacturers and automakers.

My colleague did not touch on the cultural exemption. There are side letters and that is very important for Quebec's cultural industry, but he did not mention that. I did not hear him talk about the increased number of job opportunities for the middle class in his riding. I would like him to say a few words about that.

● (1320)

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

I hope nothing will happen to the cultural exemption. I would remind the hon. member that we already had trade agreements that included a cultural exemption with 80% of the signatory countries of the TPP. Before the TPP, there was talk of negotiating an agreement with Japan. If we add that to the list of countries with which we already had an agreement, we would not be far from 100%. Every agreement already included a cultural exemption, so I hope that the government is not going back on that. That would be the last straw, because the government is already going back on supply management.

What is more, since we already had agreements, this one does not really benefit the middle class and Quebec businesses. So says the C.D. Howe Institute. Instead, this is a major setback for our farmers and our land use model, a system that works. It is a clear setback for Quebec since our farmers are being sacrificed for next to nothing in return.

Mr. Simon Marcil (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague for his speech. We are all familiar with this government's tendency to get involved in conflicts of interest, much like its predecessor. That is why I suspect it has other reasons for wanting the ratify the TPP quickly. I have a two-part question for my colleague.

First, does he really think that adding the word "progressive" to the name of the agreement is a sign of social progress?

Second, who does he think stands to benefit financially when the Liberals rush passage of this agreement, as they did with cannabis legalization?

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, before I answer my colleague's questions, I have more to say to the member opposite. The U.S. is the cultural threat here. Vietnam is not a threat to Quebec's culture and identity. The Americans are the reason for the cultural exemption.

Who is lining their pockets? Not us. The C.D. Howe Institute says we will not benefit much. Ontario and the western provinces will, but not us. Once again, English Canada's interests take precedence in the House of Commons. The two big parties think this is a good deal for their gang, so they are running with it. Too bad for Quebeckers and what they want. That is what happens when we let our neighbours make decisions for us: we keep losing ground. That needs to change now.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are hearing concerns from indigenous peoples around the lack of consultation on the CPTPP. I just received a message from Brenda Sayers of the Hupacasath First Nation on the west coast of Vancouver Island. She says:

> It is disheartening that the CPTPP is being fast-tracked without consideration for, or consultation with First Nations whose rights will be grossly undermined under several different chapters of the trade agreement. The Liberal government has promised reconciliation with First Nations and yet when presented with real opportunities, they have not only failed to follow through on this promise, but having given hope to a people whose only request is justice and fair treatment; they have made a mockery of a long broken relationship.

Maybe my friend could speak about his feelings on whether the government has really taken a path to reconciliation in this trade agreement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague.

My colleague from Mirabel will support the amendment. I am sure of it.

I would like to propose the following amendment to the amendment, which I am sure will be seconded by my colleague from Mirabel: That the amendment be amended by adding after the words "jobs in Canada" the following: especially in the agricultural sector, as this agreement creates a significant breach in supply management by offering 3.25% of the dairy market to foreign producers, despite the unanimous motion adopted in the House on February 7, 2018, that this House call on the government to ensure that there is no breach in supply management in the new Trans-Pacific Partnership.

That is my amendment to the amendment.

I fully agree with my colleague's comments on our relationship and reconciliation with first nations.

● (1325)

The Deputy Speaker: I see that the hon. member for Joliette has proposed an amendment to an amendment during the period for questions and comments. Unfortunately, that is not permissible. Hon. members are to propose amendments or amendments to amendments during their speeches.

[*English*]

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today in the House. I start by acknowledging we are on the traditional territory of the Algonquin peoples.

The trans-Pacific partnership agreement has had a convoluted and somewhat rocky road. I think we would all admit that. I would like to take a bit of time to go through its history and then take as much time as possible, given that it is abbreviated now that we are down to only 10-minute speaking segments and time allocation has already been applied, on why it is completely anti-democratic to have investor-state provisions included in agreements, particularly the one currently before us.

I would like to adopt and support the submissions of the hon. member for Essex. The trade critic for the New Democratic Party has put forward clear arguments. So has the MP for Vancouver Kingsway. I agree with all I have heard from them. This allows me to concentrate on investor-state provisions rather than delve into the different sector-by-sector problems with the TPP.

Going back to where it started, the TPP was well under way in negotiation under the previous Conservative government of Stephen Harper. It knew the TPP was under way and Canada did not have a seat at the table. Therefore, there are a number of reasons the agreement is lopsided against certain Canadian sectors. It has to do with the fact we joined late. We were aggressive with trying to be in. Some will remember that even during the 2015 election, when a government is supposed to have no more than a caretaker role, the former minister of trade was working hard to try to get this deal done. That was inappropriate, given that the writ had already dropped, but he certainly did work hard to achieve the TPP.

We know that the incoming U.S. president pulled out. That had a very substantial impact on the economic reach of the agreement. With the U.S. out, it looked like the TPP was dead. However, bad trade deals never die, they rise again, and this one came back without the United States and now with 11 countries in the trade pact.

It is important for Canadians to know that we already have trade agreements, within NAFTA, with Mexico. Therefore, that means we are agreeing to new agreements with nine new nations. When we talk about the Pacific region, I think a lot of Canadians would assume this includes the big economic players. When we hear TPP, the trans-Pacific partnership, or now as it is styled, the comprehensive and progressive TPP, or CPTPP, one would assume it would include China and Indonesia. However, large economic players in Asia are out of the agreement, other than the big one, which are Japan, as well as Malaysia, and of course Australia and New Zealand. There are smaller economic countries, such as Peru and Vietnam, as well as Singapore, which is significant but relatively small in terms of trade.

We have a cobbled together agreement that we now are rushing to pass. We were promised that we would not rush through trade deals in this place, that we would have full debate. I gather the committee has been told that it has to rush as well. Therefore, this trade agreement will not be adequately debated. That is now a foregone conclusion because of time allocation.

In the six and a half minutes remaining to me, let me explain why I submit to the House that investor-state dispute resolution sections do not belong in any agreement. They do not belong in trade agreements. They in fact have nothing to do with trade. They are often conflated and confused with trade dispute resolution agreements. Therefore, in the case of NAFTA, which, by the way, was the source of these investor dispute resolution systems, chapter 11 in NAFTA had never been requested before. They were not understood. They were not even understood by the people who negotiated NAFTA.

What we have under NAFTA is chapter 19, which deals with how one sorts out disputes over tariffs and unfair trade decision. We are used to those. That is appropriately a trade dispute resolution provision. One needs those if one has a trade deal. What we do not need is this bogus, anti-democratic investor-state provision, which arose in chapter 11 of NAFTA. What does it mean? On paper, when people first read NAFTA, including in all the fights over adopting NAFTA, none of the anti-NAFTA groups ever noticed chapter 11. No one talked about it; it was a sleeper.

● (1330)

What chapter 11 seemed to say was common sense. If someone had invested in a country and the asset that was built was expropriated, such as when Fidel Castro took over Cuba, the expropriation of assets would require compensation, which is the international norm already. It looked like chapter 11 was about that. We found out that was not what the chapter was capable of doing in the Ethyl Corporation case, when Ethyl Corporation of Richmond, Virginia brought the first chapter 11 case again Canada.

It should be noted that as of now, Canada is the most sued industrialized country under these investor-state agreements and we have lost repeatedly. We have lost, but it was not as if we did something that was a subversion of our trade, not as if we treated some country that we promised we would give it friendly treatment and it was a duplicitous action in pursuit of a trade benefit. No, we have lost when we were trying to protect public health and the environment.

Let us look at Ethyl Corporation. In that instance, the former minister of environment, Sheila Copps, heard of the efforts of groups like the one I was executive director of, Sierra Club Canada. We worked hard to get rid of a toxic gasoline additive called MMT, which is manganese based. We were joined in that effort, believe it or not, by the car makers. The car makers said that MMT gunked up the engines and compromised the catalytic converters. In other words, it increased pollution in a way that could void their warranties.

Therefore, the auto manufacturers, the environmental groups and a number of health groups, with evidence from neurotoxicologist Dr. Donna Mergler of the University of Quebec in Montreal, said that this stuff increased manganism in the human population, in other words tremors that looked a lot like Parkinson's, and at the same time threatened to void the warranties of cars. The minister of the environment brought forward a law which was passed in Parliament. The law said that we would get rid of MMT in gasoline.

It is important to know that at this point the United States Environmental Protection Agency had refused to register MMT, because its advice was that this stuff was bad for the environment, bad for human health and we should not use it. Therefore, Canada banned it.

Ethyl Corporation said that it was going to chapter 11 of NAFTA. However, before that chapter 11 case was through, the government of the day decided to settle, and we cannot say "out of court" because there are no courts involved here. These are private arbitration matters generally heard in hotel rooms. Therefore, if we are going to call a chapter 11 arbitration "out of court", we have to insert the word "kangaroo" before the word "court" so the whole thing makes sense.

However, Ethyl Corporation got out of Canada an award of $13 million U.S., which was taken out of the A-base budget of Environment Canada. If members do not think that had a chilling affect on Environment Canada's willingness to ban dangerous chemicals that were made in the United States, then they are not looking at the facts of what has happened since then. That was the first one. By the way, what was Ethyl Corporation's investment in Canada? Did it have a plant here? No. Did it create jobs here? No. It was selling the toxic gasoline additive here, and that was enough to make it an investor. The same thing happened with S.D. Myers, which was the next case.

S.D. Myers is an Ohio-based company that runs incinerators for PCB contaminated waste. Sheila Copps, former minister of environment, banned the export of PCB contaminated waste from Canada consistent with the Basel Convention to which Canada was a signatory, but S.D. Myers sued. Guess what. It was suddenly an investor. It had expected profit from taking Canadian PCB waste and burning it in Ohio.

However, when we banned the export of PCB contaminated waste from Canada, the import of PCB contaminated waste into the U.S. was illegal under U.S. law. On that set of facts, we could not imagine that we would lose, but we lost. Canada appealed to the Federal Court of Appeal, which said that it was not significant enough of an egregious error under the rules of arbitration for us to win, and so we had to pay S.D. Myers money.

We are now awaiting Bilcon, which has asked for $580 million in damages. Canada has lost in Federal Court in our efforts to defend the good decision of a very ethical, thorough, independent, thoroughly evidence-based finding of the environmental assessment panel on Bilcon's efforts to do an open-pit quarry in Digby, Nova Scotia.

Ethyl Corporation did not go to the courts in Canada, which it could have done. By the way, that decision led to the Progressive Conservative government of Nova Scotia turning down the permit and the previous Conservative Government of Canada environment minister John Baird turning down the permit. However, Bilcon, in New Jersey, went to a secret hearing under chapter 11 of NAFTA and it won.

● (1335)

TPP does not have such egregious secrecy; that is the one area in which this is different. However, we pass this and we will regret it. We will have chapter 9 suits under TPP, again from Malaysia and from Japan, and we will lose because Canada generally loses. This is corrosive to democracy, and I urge us to take investor state out of the bill in front of us.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I felt like I had come into a university lecture. The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands' intervention was very well researched and really ad lib for the most part, which is always good to see in the House.

I was trying to find the thread to the World Trade Organization. When we are a trading nation, having investor-state dispute mechanisms in place, either at the world trade level or in trade agreements, I understand the member to say that those should not be included in trade agreements. However, as a trading nation, what protections would she suggest we have in order to protect jobs in Canada?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, first I submit for my hon. friend from Guelph that there is nothing about giving foreign corporations superior rights to domestic corporations that protect jobs in Canada; it is quite the opposite. I would also suggest that the World Trade Organization does not insist on investor-state dispute resolution agreements; the protection of foreign corporations to protect their expectation of profits is outside the WTO. There was an attempt to put it inside in the multilateral agreement on investment, which was rejected within the OECD. Therefore, these are independent of WTO rules.

We should never accept them unthinkingly. I suggest for all of us, with the deepest respect for my colleagues, that they are accepting investor-state dispute resolutions in trade agreements without thinking, because we have never debated them in this place properly. We should rethink them, renegotiate them and ensure that only in the case of a foreign government's seizing actual assets would we have the reason to be able to say it owes us money. We should never owe a foreign corporation money for protecting the environment in Canada, protecting jobs in Canada and protecting labour rights in Canada.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a regular line by the left and the Green Party in Canada, to suggest that these international dispute mechanisms are somehow sinister. As a lawyer in Ontario I know, and as the hon. member is a lawyer as well she would know, that a lot of regimes have mandatory mediation processes and a number of elements to take disputes out of a long-winded laborious litigation process. Therefore, in a lot of these agreements, there are agreements for disputes to be settled in a specific way. That is what contracts are for: certainty, particularly when countries have different legal standards, whether civil code or common law, and some countries do not respect the rule of law. That type of certainty is what investors expect. That is what companies expect. That is what states expect.

I would love the hon. member to suggest for this House that it is somehow sinister in an agreement premised upon certainty to not allow parties to have choice of forum, choice of law. These are fundamental aspects of contract law. I hate how this sort of spectre of ISDS or mandatory disputes or the disputes mechanism we set up with China is somehow sinister, when it is actually meant to overcome uncertainty and incompatibility of legal systems. Does the hon. member not suggest that companies, governments and people have the ability to forge these decisions, whether it is ISDS or other mechanisms?

● (1340)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my hon. colleague from Durham fails to see that what his government did in passing the Canada—China investment treaty in secret, in cabinet, binding our country until the year 2045 to allow the People's Republic of China to bring secret arbitration cases against us with no transparency whatsoever is not sinister, or that he does not think there are some problems with that.

I am very grateful to my hon. colleague from Courtenay—Alberni for referencing the concerns of Brenda Sayers from the Hupacasath First Nation. That small first nation went all the way to court to say it was not consulted and this is dangerous to it. The first nations of this country have deep concerns because investor-state disputes can be launched based on decisions of first nations governments as well as municipal and provincial governments.

The reality of this is the hon. member for Durham is conflating once again. In the certainty of a trade deal, yes, we need to have a dispute resolution, but there is uncertainty created by saying foreign corporations have a right to challenge things that were never in the contemplation of the negotiators, to say after the fact they expected to make a big profit from this, and that now they have stopped them and that now they owe them money.

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great to be back, to be able to speak on Bill C-79 and, in particular, to be able to speak to trade.

I believe trade is part of Canada's DNA, from our beginnings with the fur trade to today, where we are a leader globally when it comes to mining, minerals and exploration. We can look at all the other sectors, be it agriculture, manufacturing, innovation and tech, and Canada is a leader.

I want to leave a statistic with the Chamber that really highlights how important trade is to Canada and how great a job we do at trade globally. We are 0.5% of Canada's population, but we do 2.5% of all global trade, five times our population. That just shows, globally, that we are a trading nation.

We look at CETA, where we were able to sign that agreement and open up another market of over 500 million people and over $20 trillion GDP in that market. Now, we look at the CPTPP and we look to Asia as another opportunity for Canada to be able to trade our great goods and services, a market of about 500 million people and $13.5 trillion GDP.

We are able to now talk about some of the benefits we will be able to experience from CPTPP if we were to sign on. Looking at our industrial and manufacturing sectors, located right in Mississauga East—Cooksville, we have Maple Leaf, a great company. They do a great deal of export. Having these tariffs stripped away from many of the countries in Asia that are part of the CPTPP that they work with will mean more jobs here in Canada and will give us greater market access.

I have heard from my constituents and the businesses in my area that this is the way forward.

Mississauga is Canada's sixth-largest city and we continue to grow, mostly through companies that are export oriented. Those export-oriented companies are producing the best jobs. Whether it be automobiles or medical devices, metals, chemicals or plastics, they are all essential components to our national economy, employing 1.7 million full-time and highly skilled Canadians, and contributing close to 11% of Canada's GDP.

Our government firmly believes that the CPTPP is the ideal agreement for Canadians and our economy. This is a high-level trade agreement that will increase Canadian exports and help us to succeed in foreign markets as a cornerstone of our government's comprehensive efforts to enhance Canada's engagement with dynamic, fast-growing and increasingly influential Asian markets. It is an important part of our commitment to diversify trade, grow our economy and strengthen our country's middle class.

Trade and investment flows between Canada and Asian economies have increased significantly since the turn of the century. From 2014 to 2016, Canada's exports of industrial and manufactured goods to the CPTPP countries accounted for an annual average of $22.4 billion. By eliminating now nearly 100% tariffs on manufactured goods, including some tariffs that are as high as 85%, a high barrier, and creating mechanisms to address non-tariff barriers to trade, the CPTPP will create opportunities for world-class Canadian businesses to increase their sales.

Once the agreement enters into force, it will enable Canadian exporters to access diverse and internationally integrated value chains. On day one of the agreement coming into force, there will be no tariffs on over 87% of industrial tariff lines, covering Canada's exports to CPTPP markets, worth an annual average of close to $20 billion over a two-year period.

What will this mean for individual industries? Allow me to provide just a few examples for Canada's multi-billion dollar chemicals and plastics industry.

● (1345)

The CPTPP will provide opportunities for companies in Ontario, the hub of Canada's plastics industry, to cutting-edge mechanical facilities in Alberta with improved market access. This industry will improve its annual average of $1.1 billion in exports to the CPTPP countries by eliminating tariffs that are as high as 50%. What a difference that will make in our exports of plastics.

With respect to metals and minerals, a sector contributing nearly 600,000 jobs here in Canada and exporting $5 billion in goods to CPTPP markets, the agreement would result in the elimination of all tariffs, again some as high as 50%. As a result, highly sought-after Canadian aluminum, steel, iron, petroleum products and precious metals will become even more competitive in such markets as Japan, Australia, Malaysia and Vietnam.

Canada's information and communication technologies sector, critical to major urban centres across Canada, is also well positioned under this agreement to meet growing needs within established and developed markets in the Asia-Pacific. In addition to eliminating tariffs, the agreement will protect companies from having to divulge their proprietary information in order to sell their products in these markets.

In the auto sector, our government listened, and listened a lot, to what Canadians had to say and made their concerns a priority. As part of the negotiations, Canada has obtained bilateral cover letters from Australia and Malaysia to establish more liberal rules of origin, which will allow our automotive manufacturers to take advantage of the preferential tariff treatment in these markets without having to adjust their current production models.

We also achieved bilateral results with Japan and Malaysia on standards and regulations in the automotive sector, a key demand from industry stakeholders as these non-tariff barriers were impeding our export abilities.

These are just a few examples of areas that could benefit from the CPTPP. By making Canadian industrial and manufacturing exports more competitive, reducing the red tape that impedes access to dynamic and growing markets, this agreement would provide Canadian businesses with significant opportunities to increase profits and create new jobs.

Beyond tariff reduction, another aspect of the CPTPP that stands to benefit Canadian companies in these sectors is the area of intellectual property. The agreement's provisions on intellectual property cover virtually all areas regarding trade and IP, including copyright, patents, trademarks, geographical indication, industrial designs, domain names and enforcement. Most importantly, the protection and enforcement of IP rights will help protect Canadian innovation and investment as our businesses trade abroad. For Canadian businesses, one of the most significant barriers to trade in some markets is uncertainty over the protection of intellectual property, including whether their intellectual property rights will be respected and enforced.

Intellectual property is valuable property and this agreement establishes a clear and predictable standard on IP rights and enforcement in the Asia-Pacific region. This will allow Canadian creators, innovators and investors to conduct trade with our new CPTPP partners with the assurance that their products will be protected while benefiting from the same rules as other parties within this agreement. In turn, this will encourage investment in innovative technologies in Canada and allow Canadians to develop and market their brands in the region.

As a result, innovative Canadian companies will be better positioned to commercialize their products in both established and fast-growing Asian markets. In addition to tariff reduction and IP rules, the agreement also addresses costly and time-consuming non-tariff barriers that make it difficult for Canadian companies to enter these foreign markets. Commitments by CPTPP members to cut away that burdensome and restrictive regulatory red tape in such sectors as cosmetics, medical devices, pharmaceuticals and ICT will provide Canadian manufacturing exporters with greater certainty and predictability that the competitive benefits their products receive from tariff elimination will be fully realized.

By establishing an effective and transparent rules-based trade system in one of the world's most dynamic and growing regions, the CPTPP will lay the groundwork for exporters in our industrial and manufacturing sectors to take advantage of these opportunities. This is why I am encouraging all of my hon. colleagues to support Bill C-79 and allow for the swift implementation of this important agreement.

● (1350)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House because this summer I personally met with many farmers, including the younger generation of farmers. Specifically, I met Eric and Jennifer Simpson, a couple my age who have a dairy farm in Rockburn. They told me that they have lost 15% of their revenue in the last few years because of concessions in the trade agreements Canada has signed with other countries. They said that the TPP could cause further losses because an even greater concession is being negotiated and will be passed under this legislation.

This is putting the next generation of farmers in a precarious position. As we know, one in eight jobs in Canada is in the agriculture and agri-food sector. We also know that our rural regions are vibrant and have strong economies thanks to agriculture. Those businesses are keeping kids in our rural schools and supporting local restaurants and other businesses that, in turn, keep people in the regions and preserve our agricultural heritage. This is just one thing that is being attacked in yet another economic agreement the Liberals are pursuing.

How can the Liberals promote a bill that will be harmful to an industry that is so crucial to our country and our rural regions?

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, we are so proud of our agriculture and agri-food industries and sectors. Our party is the party of supply management. It is something we have always defended and will always continue to defend.

At the international trade committee, through our consultations from coast to coast to coast, we had the opportunity to hear from many farmers and all those in the supply chain in agriculture. We were able to do a deeper dive and gain a better understanding of how we can be at the table defending agriculture and defending our farmers. We will always stand with supply management.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his speech today, my colleague from Mississauga did a very good job of reiterating why Liberals believe so firmly in free trade. I am wondering if he can take it back a bit, more specifically to his riding. He comes from a part of the country that has experienced a lot of growth over the last number of years. It has expanded tremendously and no doubt has benefited from these relationships and trade agreements.

Can he talk a little about how he sees the impacts of trade positively impacting his riding specifically?

● (1355)

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question pertains to my riding of Mississauga East—Cooksville and the many great businesses that do a great deal of trade right around the world. As we have heard, we punch way above our weight when it comes to trade in Canada. We have companies like Maple Leaf, which deal with agriculture and selling many of their products to many of the CPTPP countries, and also those in the manufacturing supply chain.

I know many manufacturers in my riding produce some of the products and machinery that help with mining. Many of those machines are then exported around the world to be able to do the work in various countries. This means jobs for my riding and for the ridings of all the members in this chamber. These are good, well-paying jobs. We know that export-oriented companies have some of the highest-paying jobs in our country, and that is why we have to double down on exporting and looking at diversifying our markets. This is a very important agreement in terms of enabling us to do that, to be able to reach into some emerging economies and also to have a better agreement with some very established countries like Japan, where we have a tremendous opportunity to do a great deal more business.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I note my hon. colleague extolled the virtues of this agreement to expand trade. I wonder if he has any comments on the issues I presented of the deep concern of many Canadians that we are expanding the right of Malaysian, Japanese, and other corporations within this agreement to bring cases against Canada and take public funds to compensate foreign companies for things domestic companies would never have a right to claim.

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, as I said, through our consultations from coast to coast to coast, we heard from many sectors. Yes, there are some sectors that had very serious concerns about ISDS. However, there were also other sectors, like financial services, the minerals industry and mining, which need to have these provisions in place to be 100% able with certainty, stability and assurances to invest in these countries and provide great-paying jobs here in Canada. These countries needed to have those assurances through an ISDS system that would work for them so those investments could be made. We want to ensure those precious Canadian dollars being invested in other parts of the world will be secure.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you that none of my Bloc Québécois colleagues will be attending the reception hosted by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Cuba-Canada.

This is unusual, given the deep friendship that Quebeckers and Cubans have always had. The reason we are not attending is to support Toufik Benhamiche, a Canadian citizen from Montcalm who has been held against his will in Cuba since July 7, 2017, when he was involved in an accident while on an excursion with his family.

Mr. Benhamiche has done no wrong. Even Cuba's highest court has recognized that he was a victim of a flawed judicial process.

Nothing is more important than justice, and Mr. Benhamiche, an exemplary citizen, is being deprived of it. For that reason, even though we wanted to attend tomorrow's event, we will not be going, and we invite all members of Parliament who care about justice to show solidarity for Mr. Benhamiche and his family members by not attending.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS

Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I honoured seven Coquitlam-Port Coquitlam community champions.

I started Community Champions to recognize community volunteers who work hard to make Coquitlam-Port Coquitlam the best community in Canada.

Community champions are in every community. They are our unsung heroes, like the parent who wakes up extra early to carpool the neighbourhood kids to school, the passionate coach who helps young athletes find their stride, and the fundraising superstars who collect donations to help the less fortunate.

This year's recipients are Barbara Worwood, Michael Thomas, Maria Shylov, Lawrence Schmidt, Aynsley Meldrum, Patrick McCarthy, and Laud Vidal.

● (1400)

[*Translation*]

I would like to congratulate the community champions for making Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam the best community in Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

BOB PORTER

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to pay tribute to Mr. Bob Porter, who passed away last week in Medicine Hat.

Mr. Porter was a rancher, a community leader, a family man, and a member of Parliament from 1984 to 1993. He never sought fame or headlines, but did not shy away from speaking truth to power or standing up for his constituents.

Bob came from a pioneer family that settled in southern Alberta in 1883. He took the reins of the family ranch at 18 and built a strong business as a committed and dedicated steward of the land.

Bob focused on strengthening his community through volunteering with the Kinsmen, his church, the Stampede board, the stock growers, the cattle commission, the press council, the community foundation and many others. Despite how busy he was, he always made time for family.

Bob was a strong voice for farmers, speaking his mind, voting his conscience and pushing for common sense changes. He fought U.S. trade barriers. He stood up for law-abiding gun owners, and he always put the safety of Canadians first. He was a friend who offered encouragement and guidance to me as a new MP.

May we all aspire to make Canada better and leave a legacy like that of Bob Porter.

I join with my wife, my community, my riding and my colleagues in sending thoughts and prayers to Bob's family. This country could certainly use more Bob Porters.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BAGOTVILLE CADETS

Mr. Yves Robillard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on August 10 and 11, 2018, I had the opportunity to visit the Bagotville training camp for air, sea and army cadets.

The cadet program is free and is now one of the largest leadership programs in Canada. With its emphasis on physical fitness and citizenship, the Canadian cadet program helps young Canadians to become active and engaged members of their communities today and prepares them to become the leaders of tomorrow.

I thank these young cadets for welcoming me and for getting involved in our society. They are a great example of courage and determination.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last evening I was made aware of the latest reprehensible action by the government against the charter rights of Canadian Abousfian Abdelrazik.

Mr. Abdelrazik was in Sudan in 2003 visiting his ailing mother when he was arrested by that country's notorious security service. A 2009 Federal Court judgment revealed that CSIS was complicit in his arrest and subsequent prolonged and unlawful detention and torture.

Finally released, Canada refused him a passport so that he could return to Canada, yet Mr. Abdelrazik was never charged or convicted of any offence. He required a Federal Court order based on a violation of his constitutionally guaranteed right to mobility to finally reunite with his family.

He filed a lawsuit exercising his right to compensation for violation of his charter rights. Nine years later and on the eve of his court hearing, the government, which claims to defend charter rights, moved to have the trial adjourned indefinitely.

Three successive governments have been complicit in these violations. I call on the government to end its obstructive tactics and provide Mr. Abdelrazik with the redress that is his basic right.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a warm welcome back to you and all my colleagues in the House.

Over the summer, I knocked on many doors, held many coffee meets and greets, and attended many community events in my riding of Don Valley East. These interactions enabled me to gauge the real progress our government has made for the middle class.

Parents told me about the positive impact of the Canada child benefit they receive. In my riding alone, our investment has lifted more than 17,000 children out of poverty. This year alone, our Canada summer jobs program has enabled 230 students in my riding to gain valuable work experience while making a difference in their local communities. The students I met were thrilled with the opportunity to work and learn.

I am pleased to report that there is real progress in Don Valley East.

* * *

● (1405)

GORDON YOUNG

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Gordon Young, who passed away last week at the age of 80.

Gordon's life was a life of service. He was a charter member of the Monkton Optimist Club and spent years as both a board member and a volunteer with the Galbraith Optimist Camp for Kids. He was a 4-H leader and a member of many agricultural organizations, including the Farm Safety Association, the Perth-Huron Jersey Club, the Perth County Soil and Crop Association and the Perth County Milk Producers.

He was a municipal councillor, first in the former township of Logan and later he would serve for more than a decade as councillor in the amalgamated municipality of West Perth. During our shared time together on West Perth council, I came to know Gordon for his thoughtful comments, his subtle sense of humour and his efficiency at chairing meetings. Gordon held the record for the quickest meetings at our council meetings.

To his wife Helen, his daughters Lauri and Lisa and his grandchildren, I offer my deepest condolences on their loss and our collective thanks for a life well lived.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SAINT-BRUNO-DE-MONTARVILLE ARTS CIRCUIT

Mr. Michel Picard (Montarville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, artists are an important part of our society. They define our popular culture and spark our collective imagination. They give us the opportunity to escape the every day with their thought-provoking, emotional, spiritual and sometimes even political creations.

Artists are visionaries who reflect the many faces of our society. They give us the opportunity to explore our world through poetry, painting, sculpture, music, theatre, and many more mediums. That is why I would like to invite the people of Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville and its surrounding areas to attend the 11th Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville arts circuit on September 22 and 23.

This activity is organized by the Association des artistes peintres affiliés de la Rive-Sud and it allows art lovers to discover our community's artistic diversity while touring my town. Come see the creations of 31 talented artists and participate in some of the 15 creative workshops that will be available.

* * *

[*English*]

COPTIC ORTHODOX PRIEST'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Father Angelos Saad. Hundreds recently gathered in Mississauga to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Father Angelos' service as a Coptic Orthodox priest. Father Angelos has dedicated his life to serving the Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius and the broader community.

Abouna Angelos has been instrumental in building churches, food banks, day care centres, summer camps, communal housing, professional training workshops and an Egyptian museum, just to name a few of his accomplishments.

He is a humble and selfless leader who helps those in need regardless of their faith, background and status. He is also an effective advocate for the fundamental rights of Copts in Egypt and around the world to live in peace and to practise their faith with dignity.

On behalf of all Canadians and Egyptian Copts everywhere, I would like to thank Abouna for his service and thank his family for sharing him with the rest of us.

* * *

HORATIO ALGER ASSOCIATION SCHOLARSHIPS

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise system has extended opportunity to more people than any other system ever conceived.

The Horatio Alger Association seeks to expand its blessings to those who are less fortunate. This week we had among us three of the recipients of the Horatio Alger Association scholarships, which are worth $10,000 each and provide prestigious recognition to some of the young people who have overcome the greatest hardship: to succeed.

On behalf of the House of Commons, I would like to congratulate Catherine Qi, Jonah Larsen and Jazmin Boisclair on earning these scholarships and on participating in a round table public discussion with former governor general David Johnson on how we can extend these opportunities yet further.

Finally, I would like to thank the Horatio Alger society for educating young people about the genius and extraordinary accomplishments of the free market system. May we all share in its blessings.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mrs. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about investments in water and waste-water infrastructure that keep our environment and our communities clean and safe.

● (1410)

[*Translation*]

I want to talk about a project that our government has undertaken that will benefit the people of Ottawa—Vanier for years to come.

[*English*]

Our government supported the Vanier water and sewer renewal project as part of the clean water and waste-water fund. By doing this, our government is reducing the risk of flooding and is protecting the livelihood of nearby residents while supporting a clean economy. These investments are also important to the greater region as they help ensure that harmful substances and materials stay out of our waterways.

[*Translation*]

This project protects the health and well-being of residents and of local waterways and ecosystems, while creating middle-class jobs and supporting our city's economic development.

[*English*]

Our government understands that the economy and the environment work hand in hand.

* * *

YOM KIPPUR

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tonight Jewish Canadians and Jews around the world will begin to observe the holiest day in the Hebrew calendar, Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement.

[*Translation*]

This is the last of the 10 days of penitence that begin with the Jewish new year. It is an opportunity to reflect, repent, and ask for forgiveness as the new year begins.

[*English*]

It is a time to gather with friends and family and together work toward each being a better person and better member of the community. It is also a time to celebrate the important role that Jewish Canadians have played over the last 268 years and will continue to play in building a stronger, greater Canada.

I would like to ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing all those observing Yom Kippur a *G'mar Chatimah Tovah*. Let people of all faiths join together to build a happier and more harmonious world.

* * *

WORLD MARROW DONOR DAY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Saturday was World Marrow Donor Day.

[*Translation*]

It is a day to recognize and thank those who donated cells or marrow for transplant.

[*English*]

Our family received devastating news two and a half years ago when our nephew Lincoln was diagnosed with aplastic anemia, meaning that a simple cold or a cut could kill him. His only hope was a bone marrow transplant. Against all odds, a match was found, one match in the entire world. An anonymous stranger took the time to sign up, went through testing and agreed to donate her bone marrow. Those acts of selfless kindness saved his life.

This week we found out her name: Ann. To Ann and all those donors, we say, "Thank you. You are our heroes."

On this occasion, I would like to encourage Canadians between the ages of 17 and 35 to go to blood.ca to find out how they can register to be a donor. It only takes a few minutes and it can save other lives, just like Lincoln's.

* * *

METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is facing a crisis. Last year there were 35 overdose deaths from methamphetamine in our province, more than both fentanyl and carfentanil. In the past four years use among adults has doubled and use among youth has increased by 50%. There are regular reports of drug-induced psychosis which leads to significant increases in violent crime, stray needles posing substantial health risks to our public areas and strains on our public health system. It is a problem that spans from urban centres to small rural towns and indigenous communities from coast to coast to coast. We need to take action and we need to work together to address this issue.

I am pleased that the health committee unanimously agreed to my motion to study the impacts of methamphetamine abuse in Canada and to develop concrete recommendations for the federal government, the provinces and territories. I look forward to working with my colleagues so we can make a difference for Canadians and address this crisis.

[*Translation*]

YOUNG FARMERS

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, dairy producers in Abitibi—Témiscamingue and many other parts of Quebec find themselves in an untenable position because of uncertainty around NAFTA negotiations and the United States' demands with respect to supply management.

I would like to tell you about Camille Allen. She grew up on her parents' farm in Clériсy and is now studying farm business management so that she can take over the family farm one day. Camille is afraid that her family business could be sold or dismantled if the government gives in on supply management. She is afraid that years of investment and sacrifice might go up in smoke along with her dream because we were unable to protect a system that has served Canadian consumers and producers so well for decades.

Camille and other farmers in Abitibi—Témiscamingue are counting on us and on this government to do right by them and stand up to the American giant. Our next generation of farmers is too precious for us to let them down. We need to think about the future of Canadian agriculture and our rural farms.

* * *

● (1415)

CHICOUTIMI—LE FJORD

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to use my first statement to thank the people of my riding, Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, for placing their trust in me. My constituents have sent a clear message to this government: 53% of the people in my riding chose our party's leadership over Liberal leadership.

My constituents are worried about the impact of marijuana legalization. They are concerned about the state of public finances. They are hungry for economic development. Farmers, the pride of our region, are worried about the upcoming concessions on supply management.

I am very pleased to finally take my seat in the House in order to hold this government to account after its summer of failure. The people of Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, much like the member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, no longer trust the Liberal government.

In 2019, Canadians from coast to coast to coast will prove how much they have lost faith in this government.

* * *

[*English*]

URBAN TRANSIT

Mr. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the Canadian Urban Transit Association to Ottawa for its annual transit awareness day.

[*Translation*]

Efficient and reliable public transit systems play an important role in the lives of millions of Canadians. In partnership with the CUTA, we have developed and implemented an infrastructure investment program to meet the needs of Canadian communities.

In my riding, Hull—Aylmer, we look forward to the Société de transport de l'Outaouais' light rail project, made possible through federal and provincial funding. In Hull—Aylmer, we will soon be able to take light rail to go to work, to go to school and to do our shopping.

[*English*]

Working with CUTA means working with Canadians to invest in the future to build sustainable communities.

[*Translation*]

I am pleased to welcome and thank members of the CUTA who are here with us today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

STEEL INDUSTRY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals bragged about collecting over $300 million in counter-tariffs from the United States. That money was meant to go straight to Canadian steel and aluminum workers, but we now know that they were given only $11,000. The Prime Minister's summer of failure claims more victims. They could not count on on the Prime Minister's fine words when he said he would be there for the workers.

Why is he not putting that money right back into workers' pockets?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said throughout the year, we will be there to support our workers in the steel and aluminum industry and in every industry across the country. We have introduced measures to help them when needed. We will continue to be sure to diversify our economy in order to help our aluminum and steel workers innovate. We will continue to defend these industries from the United States' reckless and punitive actions.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the recent decision on Trans Mountain shows that the Liberals, and I quote, "failed to...dialogue meaningfully". In other words, the Prime Minister promised to improve things and then broke his promise as soon as he could. That should not come as news to Canadians.

After three years of empty promises from this Prime Minister and a list of failures, why should we have faith in his claim that a pipeline will be built?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would rather talk about the 10 years of failures under the Harper government, which refused to accept that protecting the environment and creating economic growth go hand in hand. Furthermore, the Conservatives continued to marginalize indigenous communities. They have been criticizing us for the past three years because we are doing too much for the environment and too much to work on reconciliation with indigenous peoples. On the contrary, the court just said that we need to do more, and this is exactly what we are going to do. We know that protecting the environment—

● (1420)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

[*English*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister seems to be the only person who thinks that things are going well in Canada's energy sector. The judge ruled very clearly. This Prime Minister failed to do proper consultation, and where he failed, the Conservatives succeeded with four major pipeline projects built, including the Enbridge Alberta Clipper, the TransCanada Keystone, and Kinder Morgan Anchor Loop. On the Kinder Morgan Anchor Loop, "this will increase the ability of Canadian producers and marketers to access growing markets on the West Coast as well as Asian markets." That is from a Kinder Morgan statement, because that pipeline opened up—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years they were unable to get our resources to new markets. The reason they were unable, despite everything they tried, is that they thought the way to get things built to new markets was by eliminating environmental oversight, or "obstacles" as they would say, and continuing to marginalize indigenous peoples. We know that growing the economy goes hand in hand with protecting the environment and with reconciliation. That is exactly what we are doing to grow our economy and protect Canadians for the future.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is this Prime Minister who destroyed real economic opportunity for first nations people when he cancelled northern gateway and ripped that opportunity away from so many northern indigenous communities. It is this Prime Minister who has made Canada more dependent on foreign energy by killing energy east so we have to continue importing oil from places like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. However, it was the Conservative government that got pipelines built, that got our energy to foreign markets.

Why does this Prime Minister have it in for Canada's energy sector?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if anyone in this place or anyone across this country needed proof that the Conservatives do not know what they are talking about when it comes to indigenous peoples, citing the end of the northern gateway pipeline as something that went against indigenous peoples proves that they are hopelessly out of touch with the concerns of indigenous peoples. Yes, there are voices in indigenous communities on all sides of the debate, but the fact that the Conservative government did not respect indigenous voices is why it could not get things built.

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's summer failure has also included his carbon tax coalition falling apart in tatters, but even before Rachel Notley pulled out and abandoned the carbon tax plan, the Prime Minister abandoned his own plan. He announced that he would give big businesses and big emitters with big government relations experts a special deal. They would be exempted up to almost 90% of their emissions. Meanwhile, individual hard-working families will have to bear the entire brunt.

When will the Prime Minister finally do the right thing and join the millions of Canadians who are clamouring—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we understand how important it is to fight climate change while building a strong economy for the future and good jobs for Canadians over the coming generations. That means we agree that putting a price on pollution, making sure that polluters pay, is the best way to move forward. Now, the Conservatives do not have a plan to fight climate change and will not tell us what they plan to do. We just know they are offering the same 10 years of Stephen Harper doing nothing on the environment.

* * *

● (1425)

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in October 2015, the Prime Minister condemned the fact that the trans-Pacific partnership was negotiated in secret. In October 2015, the Prime Minister declared that he would never touch supply management and that there would be no concessions.

Dairy farmers in my region and across Canada depend on supply management and are telling me how important it is to the survival of family farms.

Can the Prime Minister tell us what has changed between 2015 and now?

Can he promise to keep supply management intact?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have been saying for years and almost a decade, the Liberal Party will always defend supply management. We all agree on this side of the House, which is not the case with all parties. We know that this system works and that it protects both our farmers and our consumers. We will continue to defend supply management and dairy producers.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, I was in Saint-Mathieu-de-Rioux visiting a family farm owned by Charles, who has been a dairy farmer for 31 years. He works around the clock, without a break, and he figures he earns about $5.50 per hour.

Charles told me that his family's financial situation is shaky because of what the Conservatives and Liberals gave away when they negotiated CETA and the TPP.

In 2015, the Prime Minister promised he would not touch supply management. Will he keep that promise once and for all and stop leaving everyone hanging?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will continue to defend supply management. It works for dairy farmers and Canadian consumers. We have signed international agreements while protecting our system. We will continue to defend a system that works for Canadians and farmers.

[*English*]

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 2015, the Prime Minister said on television that the TPP should never be negotiated in secret, and now he is signing on to a deal that he negotiated in secret. The Prime Minister also told Canadians that he would never compromise on supply management, and now his government is doing exactly that and trading it away. Farmers are scared they are going to lose their family farms.

When will the Prime Minister start keeping his pre-election promises and stop using these farmers' livelihoods as a bargaining chip?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many times in the House and out of it, we will continue to defend supply management. With the CPTPP moving forward through the House this week, I am happy to highlight the fact that, indeed, the deal, as it was signed by the Conservative government, was not good enough for Canadians. That is why we continued to negotiate. We made significant positioning in Da Nang and with our partners so that we would get to an improved deal that included things like a cultural exemption that the Conservatives, for example, were willing to give away in TPP. We know how to stand up for Canadians, and we always will.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the Prime Minister understands what they have signed on to.

The trans-Pacific partnership will be a blow to Windsor-Essex. People in my region are begging the Liberals to hold off on pushing through this job-killing trade deal. I met with small business owners over the summer who warn they were being slammed by steel tariffs and may be forced to shut down.

Yesterday I called on the Liberals to delay the CPTPP so Canadians could brace for a possible failed NAFTA and more U.S. tariffs. Instead, they are steamrolling the deal through Parliament without proper debate.

Why are the Liberals hell-bent on killing Canadian manufacturing jobs?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again we find ourselves in a very familiar situation in the House. The NDP do not want any deals for Canadians. The New Democrats do not want to sign any trade deals; the Conservatives are willing to sign anything they can.

We know that only signing good deals for Canadians is in our best interests. As with the CPTPP, when it comes to NAFTA, we will sign a good deal or we will not sign.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MARIJUANA

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, less than a month from now, the Prime Minister is going to legalize marijuana across Canada, much to the delight of his friends in the industry.

Meanwhile, police forces across the country are saying that they will not be adequately trained or equipped and will simply not be ready. The Prime Minister did not listen to the municipalities, experts, doctors and, above all, police services.

How can he justify yet another failure at the expense of Canadian families?

● (1430)

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that I have met regularly with the law enforcement leadership of the country. Unlike the previous government, we actually listened to what they asked of us.

They asked, for example, for the opportunity to give a ticket to a young person rather than criminalizing the person for simple possession of marijuana. We listened; the Conservatives did not. They asked for the technology and the training needed to keep our roadways safe, dealing with impaired driving. We gave them what they asked for.

I have met with law enforcement agencies across the country. They are working diligently. They will be ready to keep our communities safe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on top of this government's failed attempts to negotiate NAFTA, Canada is heading straight for another major conflict with our American allies on the issue of legalizing marijuana.

Jean-Pierre Rancourt, a lawyer who practices in the United States, has said that Canadians could be refused entry into the U.S.

Can the Prime Minister guarantee that Canadians who choose to use marijuana once it is legal will be able to enter the United States, or is that just one more failure he will have on his conscience?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would simply remind the House that since 2013, we have had a well-regulated medical marijuana industry, which employs tens of thousands of Canadians and which Canadians have invested hundreds of millions of dollars and yet is has had no impact on their ability to cross the border.

We have entered into discussions with our counterparts in the United States to ensure that Canadians are treated fairly and according to the rule of law when they cross into the United States.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES, AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the minister informed us that as soon as he was appointed, he asked to meet with his American counterpart to begin discussions on the safe third country agreement. However, the Americans have confirmed that some discussions have already taken place. It seems the Prime Minister has not informed his minister of that yet. They have not had time to talk.

Meanwhile, illegal migrants are flouting our laws, the provinces are left footing with the bill, and Canadians are being called racists if they dare to criticize the Prime Minister. The summer of Liberal failure continues. We have a plan. The Liberals do not.

When will they deal with the problem with the safe third country agreement?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. As I indicated yesterday, Canada has a long and proud tradition of providing protection to those who are in most need of protection by providing refuge to the world's most vulnerable people.

The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act requires the ongoing review of all designated safe third countries to ensure the conditions that led to their designation continue to be met. As per my mandate, I have already sent a letter to Secretary Nielsen, asking to enter into discussions related to irregular border migration of our shared border, including ways in which we can enhance and improve the existing safe third country agreement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the summer of Liberal failure continues.

The minister has just taken up his new position, but we have learned that discussions to change the safe third country agreement are already under way. We are once again being told that we are wrong about the people coming to Canada illegally, but the Liberals are trying to negotiate the same thing that we have been proposing from the outset.

Now, we have ministers who are going to Washington to mock the current government, and we have a Prime Minister who is negotiating an economic agreement using cultural arguments.

When will the government deal with the problem with the safe third country agreement?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Harper Conservatives, we make evidence-based decisions.

The data from July 2018 show that half as many border crossers were intercepted this year as last year. The Harper Conservatives continue to politicize the issue by instilling fear so that eventually they can recommend militarizing the border. They need to stop spreading misinformation. We are going to keep our international commitments and keep Canadians safe at the same time.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we did not have an illegal border crossing crisis under Prime Minister Harper. Any other Canadians telling their boss that they spent hundreds of millions of dollars on a problem that got worse would get fired. Therefore, when the current Prime Minister stands here and tells Canadians that he has spent hundreds of millions of their tax dollars on illegal border crossers, but their numbers continue to grow, it is clear by this failure that he needs to go.

How many illegal border crossers are currently being housed in hotels at taxpayer expense?

● (1435)

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will educate the hon. member on the Conservatives' disastrous record on immigration.

Parents and grandparents had a backlog of 167,000. We have reduced that to 25,000. Spouses had to wait 26 months to reunite. We have reduced that from 75,000 to 15,000. Live-in caregivers, who provide an invaluable service to Canadians, had to wait five to seven years under that party. We have reduced their backlog from 62,000 to 11,000.

The Conservatives had a disastrous record and Canadians know that.

The Speaker: Order, please. Frequently in the House members will hear things they disagree with or that they are dissatisfied with. They should expect that I am sure by now. Members should be able to contain themselves and not react until it is their turn, which they will get eventually.

The hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Let us talk about education, Mr. Speaker. It has been under the current government that Canadians have lost social license for immigration because of that minister's failure to close the loophole on the safe third country agreement. It has been the current Prime Minister and the current minister who are putting ahead people who have reached upstate New York instead of reuniting Yazidi genocide victims. It has been the current government that over and over again has prioritized people who are not legitimate refugees over the world's most vulnerable.

When will the government close the loophole in the safe third country agreement?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about Yazidi refugees. The Conservatives brought a grand total of three Yazidis to Canada. We have brought 1,400 Yazidi survivors of violence to Canada, and we are encouraging private sponsors to bring even more.

Let us talk about private sponsored refugees who need the generosity of Canadians. When it came time to lead and fulfill the generosity of Canadians, the Conservatives only had 4,500—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Why didn't your boss hire someone else to do your job?

The Speaker: Order, please. I did not hear anyone yelling when the member for Calgary Nose Hill was asking her question. I would ask her not to do so either. I think all members know better than that.

I would ask the hon. Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship to finish his answer.

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the generosity of Canadians, we have increased the private sponsored refugee program spaces to 18,000.

That is our record. The Conservative could not do it. We are getting it done.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am going to describe how the people of Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie reacted to the purchase of the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Richard Côté wrote to me and said that the purchase of Trans Mountain is looking more and more like the greatest waste of public money in Canada's history. Mathieu Filion asks us to just imagine if the government had invested this money in projects to support the environment and the energy sources of the future. We could have become world leaders. That is exactly what should have been done.

When will the Liberals take climate change and the jobs of the future seriously?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that it is very important to have access to the international market. That is important.

That is why we considered the Trans Mountain pipeline and its expansion. We will now look at the facts following the Federal Court ruling to ensure that we have a significant engagement with indigenous people and to consider the environmental situation.

That will be part of our plan. It is a significant approach. We will continue with our approach.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, their process was flawed and the Federal Court put them in their place. That is what happened.

It is not just the people on the Island of Montreal who are worried. In Salaberry—Suroît, which has Enbridge's line 9B pipeline running through it, people have serious concerns. The necessary upgrades are not being made, safety valves are substandard, and the National Energy Board is protecting the oil company and even refuses to respond to requests for information from the RCM. Imagine if energy east resurfaced.

Are the Liberals working for Canadians or for the oil companies? The answer is clear when we see the Minister of Environment hosting barbecues in an Enbridge apron.

● (1440)

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about international markets. That is very important. That is why we considered the Trans Mountain situation. We know that it is important to consider the concerns of first nations. We are deeply committed to doing this right. Of course, it is also very important to consider the environment, and that is what we are going to do.

It is important to have an approach and a plan. We have a plan for improving the situation and continuing with the pipeline project.

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister described his failure on the Trans Mountain expansion as "almost a really good thing". Only Liberal logic would say it is a good thing that their failure cost thousands of workers their jobs.

Two thousand families have lost good-paying jobs and now are stressed about their uncertain futures. This is not "almost a really good thing". It has been three weeks. A really good thing would be to tell these families what the plan is to get their jobs back.

Where is the plan for the Trans Mountain expansion?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the decision to ignore the impact of marine traffic on the environment was done by the Harper government. The decision to ignore the protection of endangered species was made under the Harper government.

The court has acknowledged that we put a framework together that was acceptable. We need to engage with indigenous peoples in a way that is meaningful. There is a two-way dialogue that allows us to find mitigation where it is possible to do so. That is exactly the plan we are putting forward.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, whenever he fails, he just blames others. However, former Toronto Liberal MP and two-time Liberal leadership candidate Martha Hall-Findlay agrees the Liberals are failing. She said that Bill C-69 was "deeply flawed" and "Now is not the time to pass legislation that could make our investment climate even worse."

The Liberals killed three private sector pipelines. Their failure stole Trans Mountain. One hundred thousand energy workers lost their jobs and hundreds of thousands more are at risk. Billions in investment is leaving Canada.

Will the Prime Minister scrap his no new pipeline Bill C-69 before he completely obliterates the Canadian energy sector?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the Harper Conservatives were in power today, there would be no TMX, because they are against the purchase we made for workers and getting our resources to global markets, and making sure that jobs are created for the workers and for British Columbians. We are going to move forward on this project in the right way, respecting the rights of indigenous peoples to be meaningfully consulted and at the same time protecting the environment. That is the path forward we are developing.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government's Trans Mountain failure has real consequences for indigenous peoples. Chief Ernie Crey of Cheam First Nation had this to say:

> What we've negotiated will be lasting training and lasting jobs...Every day our young people come to me and say they want to get trained, they want a job, and they want to say goodbye to welfare....To us, it means millions of dollars to my band alone...

These are more casualties from the Prime Minister's summer of failure. When will the Liberals present a plan to get Trans Mountain built?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one thing that is absolutely clear from this ruling is that in order to build large energy infrastructure projects, we cannot ignore our constitutional obligation to properly consult with indigenous peoples. We also cannot ignore our obligation to protect the environment.

We will be coming back with a plan that will allow us to protect the environment, respect indigenous peoples' rights to be included and at the same time grow the economy and create middle-class jobs.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a strong Alberta energy sector creates jobs right across Canada. For example, when the Prime Minister killed Energy East, 300 jobs were lost at a GE plant in Peterborough.

After a summer of failure, the government's bungling of Trans Mountain jeopardizes many more Ontario manufacturing jobs. The government is failing Canadians as investment flees Canada. The government is failing Canadians as families lose the means to keep food on their table.

When will the Prime Minister finally present a plan to Canadians to get Trans Mountain built?

● (1445)

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me share some numbers: 3,600 jobs created by Amazon; 295 new jobs created by Burloak Technologies; 675 new jobs created by Stem Cell Technologies; 300 new jobs created by Bell Helicopter; 1,250 jobs created by Sanofi; 4,900 jobs created by ENCQOR; 2,200 jobs created by Nova Chemicals in Alberta.

That is getting the job done.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister came to Nanaimo the air was choked with smoke. He heard "climate change worsens wildfires". He heard coastal people warn of increased oil tanker spill risk. Some called it "a national disaster". He did not listen. Just a week later the Liberals bought the pipeline just as the courts were shutting its expansion down.

When will the government finally listen to coastal communities, shelve the climate change hypocrisy and cancel the Kinder Morgan expansion?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has an ambitious plan to protect the environment and grow the economy at the same time. Our emissions are dropping and Canadians have created over half a million jobs in the past few years.

We are moving forward with putting a price on pollution and investing in the green economy. If the NDP cannot get on board with growing our economy while we put forward aggressive measures to protect our environment, then they are going to find themselves in opposition for a very long time.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Fin Donnelly (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week Canadians were devastated when Scarlet, a three-and-a-half-year-old orca, was declared dead.

Coastal communities and people right across the country continue to voice their concerns on the effect of increased tanker traffic on our coast but the Liberals are not listening. Instead of acting to protect this endangered species now, the Liberals are in court defending their inaction and continue to push for the expansion of Trans Mountain.

Canadians do not want to see another orca die. Will the minister issue an emergency order now and protect these whales?

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ensuring the protection of Canada's oceans and the sustainability of marine life are key priorities for our government. Our government is committed to the protection of Canada's resident killer whales and the recovery of these populations.

Our government is working in partnership with indigenous peoples, key stakeholders, international partners and the province of British Columbia on immediate actions to reduce the impact of marine shipping and assist in the recovery of southern resident killer whales.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, students in my riding of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook and across the country have been back in school for a few weeks now. Parents proudly chose to have their children educated in French, either through the immersion program or through the provincial Acadian school board's French first-language program. They made this choice because they want their children to be bilingual. They want their children to be able to speak both of this country's languages. They are proud of our history, and they see the opportunities.

Could the Minister of Official Languages tell us how the action plan will help these programs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have developed an excellent action plan for official languages. We have invested $2.7 billion in official languages, which is the largest investment in official languages in our history. We want to protect and promote the rights of language minority communities, and we will achieve this by investing in our children, in early childhood, and in education to ensure the survival of our official language communities.

* * *

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week the Liberals' summer of failure included a stop in Saskatchewan. One failure top of mind for Saskatchewanians is the Liberals' carbon tax grab. The Liberals are continuing their attack on hard-working families and struggling seniors with their unaffordable carbon tax.

Will the Prime Minister stop punishing Saskatchewan by imposing a federal carbon tax and recognize the authority of the province?

● (1450)

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the environment is a priority for this government. We will not apologize for putting a price on pollution. The fact is the cost of inaction is too great to ignore. By 2020, Canadians are going to be bearing almost $5 billion as a result of extreme weather events such as forest fires and floods. We need to move forward with a plan to grow the economy and protect the environment at the same time.

Under the Harper Conservatives, they failed to put a plan in action. They still have no plan today. I am shocked and I am sure my colleagues will join me in my disappointment if their plan is to make pollution free.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government's summer of failure continues at Canadians' expense.

Yesterday, in an interview with Maclean's magazine, the Prime Minister was very clear. He said that regardless of what happens, he is going to impose the Liberal carbon tax. He is going to impose it on the provinces, even though none of them agree with it. Worse still, he is going to impose it on Canadian families without giving them all the information.

Could the Prime Minister tell Canadians the truth for once? He has the document in hand. Will he tell us how much the Liberal carbon tax is going to cost Canadian families?

[*English*]

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in environment it is our preference to work with the provinces and territories, but when the provinces will not take the responsibility to protect the environment, then we will put forward a plan that ensures every Canadian takes part in a framework that puts a price on pollution.

If there is anything that is being hidden here it is the Conservatives' plan. I would invite all the Canadians who would like to see what their plan is to check out the Conservative leader's platform he ran on during their convention if he had not deleted it from his website after he had won. They have no plan.

We will grow the economy. We will protect the environment at the same time. It is what Canadians expect. It is what they deserve and it is what we will deliver to them.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in fact, the government does believe that pollution should be absolutely free if one has a powerful lobbyist. One of the fine-print details in their carbon tax plan is that large corporate industrial polluters will not have to pay it on 80% to 90% of their emissions, even though single moms and seniors will pay it on 100% of their home heating and gas bills that they pay just for the luxury of going to work in the morning.

Why is it that this party of privilege, whenever it proposes new taxes, always exempts its wealthy friends?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems the Conservatives have no plan for the environment and the NDP members have no plan for the economy. We are moving forward with a plan that is going to grow the economy and protect the environment at the same time. We are putting in measures that put a price on pollution so it is not free for emitters, but we are also recognizing that certain trade-exposed industries need to remain competitive in the global marketplace.

We are moving forward with a plan that will make life more affordable for Canadians and more expensive for polluters.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I will remind the hon. member for Edmonton Manning that we each get our turn here eventually and one waits until they have their turn before speaking.

The hon. member for Carleton.

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this has been a summer of tax fairness failure for this particular government. We all know that middle-class families are paying $800 more in income taxes under the government, but we learned that the wealthiest taxpayers, the 1%, are paying $4.5 billion less, according to CRA data. Would it not then just be predictable that they would hit working-class families with higher carbon taxes while giving an exemption to those well-lobbied-for industrial polluters?

Why is it that wealthy Liberal insiders always get the breaks?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that the member for Carleton would not knowingly mislead this House. Perhaps what he is trying to refer to, though, is the fact that we raised taxes on the top 1%. Maybe that is what he is referring to. If he actually looks carefully at what we have done, we lowered taxes on middle-class Canadians so they are in better shape. If he takes into account the Canada child benefit, what one can see is that Canadian families, average middle-class families in 2019, will be $2,000 better off than they were in 2015. These are the facts. We would be happy to give him a briefing if he would like to understand them better.

* * *

● (1455)

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I learned of a veteran who has been waiting for over a year for treatment of glaucoma, one of thousands of veterans waiting on claims just to be opened, processed and then to actually receive the benefits they deserve.

The Conservatives failed to spend over $1 billion in seven years allocated for veterans and now we know that the Liberals have left yet another $375 million unspent in just three years. That is enough money to clear the growing backlog of veterans who are tired of waiting.

How can the Liberals justify failing to spend this money on the veterans who need it the most?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will ensure that veterans receive all the benefits they have earned. In fact, it is our top priority.

As I said yesterday, our benefits are demand-driven, and so whether it is 10 or 10,000, we will always make sure that eligible veterans come forward and they will receive the benefits to which they are entitled. They are based on estimates, and this process guarantees that whether a veteran comes forward this year, next year or the year after, we will always have the resources available for our veterans.

I would only ask and I would encourage the NDP to look inward at their plan for veterans or lack thereof.

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, speaking of looking inward, people with disabilities have been waiting for far too long for a national accessibility act.

Canadians were disappointed when Liberal legislation was tabled with no timeline and no requirements. Services as important as VIA Rail could ask for an exemption from the act. For each member in the House, we have to face people living with disabilities, people who face barriers every single day, and we are with them—

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud that tomorrow we are commencing debate on second reading of Bill C-81, the accessibility act.

I can tell members that, in my opinion, this will be the most significant piece for disability rights legislation since the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

I am excited to be working with the member opposite on this bill. I am excited that we can get it to committee tomorrow as soon as possible so that we can make it as substantively great as we possibly can to include the full participation and inclusion of every Canadian in our society.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a serious ethics problem. He is the first prime minister in the history of our country to be found guilty of breaking ethics laws. His Minister of Finance is guilty of breaking ethics laws. Now, during his summer of failure, his most trusted cabinet minister and his close childhood friend was also found guilty of breaking ethics laws. Guilty. Guilty. Guilty.

Will the Prime Minister finally act and fire his close friend or does he truly believe his friends and all Liberals are above the law?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Ethics Commissioner said, in this this case there was no preferential treatment given and there was no financial benefit derived.

My colleague manufactures great indignation. He talks about people who should in fact be found to have not followed the law. He does not mention a guy who was in this House called Dean Del Mastro, who in fact left in a sheriff's van with handcuffs and leg irons on for not following the law. Where was the manufactured outrage at that point?

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Liberal government is becoming notorious for its flagrant disregard of ethical practices and in its summer of failure for its failure to abide by the Prime Minister's promises of accountable government. The PM and his ministers are shameless in the face of accumulating conflict-of-interest violations and shameless now caught in breaking their own rules, allowing registered lobbyists to buy their way into exclusive Liberal fundraising events for access to government decision-makers that ordinary citizens do not have.

Why do Liberals think the law is for everyone else?

● (1500)

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are proud to have brought forward Bill C-50 and we are proud to be taking concrete action to disclose even more information than has ever been done before when it comes to fundraising.

However, what we do not know is who is attending Conservative fundraising events. For example, the $1,525 event that was held on July 28, 2016, or perhaps the $1,550 fundraiser that was held on June 21, 2017 or perhaps the $1,525 event that was held on April 21, 2016. Who was attending their events? What do they have to hide?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this has been a disastrous summer for the Liberals, and their priority has not been to work for the economic well-being and prosperity of our country. Rather, they have once again been focusing on garden parties and private access to clubs that line the Liberal Party's pockets.

The Liberals have not shown the slightest bit of remorse after all the years that they have spent violating the ethics rules by allowing ministers to help party cronies.

There is a long list of examples of privileged access for Liberal cronies. When will the Liberals be fair, equitable and transparent when it comes to their fundraising?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the measures that we have taken on this side of the House, particularly in Bill C-50.

We, on this side of the House, are transparent about our fundraising activities. What we do not know is who is attending the Conservative Party fundraisers. What do the Conservatives have to hide?

On July 28, 2016, it cost $1,525 to get access to the Conservatives. On June 21, 2017, it cost $1,550.

What do the Conservatives have to hide? Why are they not being transparent?

* * *

[*English*]

SENIORS

Ms. Kim Rudd (Northumberland—Peterborough South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, seniors in my riding of Northumberland—Peterborough South have told me they worry about their financial security. Whether they are retired or approaching retirement, they are concerned not only about their future finances, but also about the day-to-day costs they face right now. We owe Canadian seniors for their contributions to building this great country. We need to provide a quality of life we can be proud of.

Could the Minister of Seniors please tell the House more about our commitment to Canadian seniors and their quality of life?

Hon. Filomena Tassi (Minister of Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to rise for the first time in the House as the Minister for Seniors.

Our government will continue to work hard for seniors. We have raised 100,000 seniors out of poverty by rolling back the age of entitlement for OAS and GIS from 67 to 65. We have increased the GIS for the most vulnerable single seniors. Those seniors are receiving up to $947 more a year. We have invested $40 billion into a national housing strategy—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

* * *

LABOUR

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in parts of rural Ontario, municipalities have planned mail-in ballots for their upcoming elections on October 22. Their chief administration officers have raised concerns over reports of a possible postal strike.

Could the Prime Minister tell the House what measures he has put into place to ensure that the elections proceed as planned?

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government respects and has faith in the collective bargaining process. Mediators from the federal mediation and conciliation service are working with both parties to assist them in reaching an agreement. We are closely monitoring this labour dispute and we encourage both sides to get down and get an agreement on this issue.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, more and more people are being diagnosed with Lyme disease every year because of climate change.

Hundreds of Canadians like Simon Martin, a resident of my riding, are contracting this disease. Its victims include wildlife officers and children.

Why is the government leaving these people out in the cold by failing to implement the federal framework on Lyme disease? Where is the $4 million that was earmarked for research into better diagnostic testing and a broader range of treatments?

Why is the government forcing people with Lyme disease to wander in the medical wilderness instead of taking action now?

● (1505)

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government recognizes that Lyme disease is a growing health problem associated with climate change.

More and more cases are being reported each year. We are helping Canadians protect themselves from Lyme disease by teaching them how to prevent infection, and we are supporting organizations that teach health professionals how to identify the disease.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday our government moved one step closer toward the ratification process of the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, the CPTPP. This is a very significant and important step in our national trade diversification strategy.

Could the Minister of International Trade Diversification update the House on the ratification process of this important trade deal for Canadians?

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from New Brunswick Southwest for her excellent committee work.

We have made it clear that our government is committed to the implementation of the CPTPP. This trade agreement will open a market of 500 million consumers, which will result in growth and jobs for Canadians. We are working to diversify trade so the middle class can compete and win on the world stage. We look forward to working with all MPs to get this done.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for the Citadel in Quebec City, the Liberals are using non-compliant, lesser-quality American stone, when the original stone is available across the river in Lévis. According to experts, the stone being used does not meet the technical, geological and heritage criteria to respect the integrity of the Citadel.

How can the Prime Minister live with this unacceptable situation, where jobs are at stake and the integrity and status of Quebec City as a world heritage city are in jeopardy?

[*English*]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government values the rich heritage of the Quebec City Citadel. That is why we are taking steps to protect it. An open and transparent process awarded a Quebec bidder the contract to replace the damaged stone. This bidder is required to adhere to the federal guidelines to ensure that the citadel retains its UNESCO status. National Defence is doing its due diligence to ensure that the winning stone adheres to the heritage qualifications because we understand the importance of this to Quebec City.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government awarded a contract for three icebreakers to Davie shipyard this summer. The part that the government is leaving out is that the contract was so small that Davie had to lay off 400 more people. That was a nice try to avoid responsibility, but we are not going to abandon our workers.

The Prime Minister ordered his new Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard to renew the fleet by acquiring new ships.

Will the minister follow that order by offering a real contract to Davie shipyard as early as this fall?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is getting results for Canadians by providing the Coast Guard with the ships it needs to serve the Canadian public. This summer, we gave the Davie shipyard a contract worth $610 million, which will create 200 good jobs, so that we can give the Coast Guard the equipment it needs.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what we are asking for is merely a drop in the bucket compared to the historic misappropriation of funds. Under the Conservatives, the federal government awarded $100 billion in shipbuilding and maintenance contracts. Quebec was granted barely 1% of those contracts.

The vice-president of Davie shipyard said that if Quebec had been awarded its fair share of contracts, at least $20 billion, the shipyard would be at full employment for years, at least a decade.

Will the Liberals rise above the Conservatives and give Quebec its fair share of contracts?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very aware of the excellent work done by Davie's workers. This summer we gave the Davie shipyard a $610-million contract for three icebreakers and the conversion of a first vessel. This will create up to 200 good jobs for the middle class.

* * *

● (1510)

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are some politicians who believe that we should remain silent about Trans Mountain because we receive equalization payments. They have therefore entered into a unilingual contract.

Do we know what this pipeline is going to cost Quebeckers?

We have already paid almost $1 billion and we do not know how much more we are going to throw at it. It is like Muskrat Falls, a project that is bad for Hydro-Québec and that is going to bankrupt Newfoundland. Quebeckers will bear the cost.

When will Ottawa stop using Quebeckers' money to put us in the poor house?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the approach we have chosen is important for our economy. The approach is good for the future because our products will be able to access international markets. It is an economic project and an important economic opportunity. We will ensure that the Trans Mountain project is good for our country's economy.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a deep privilege for me to represent Durham. At this the start of the fall session, it is great to be able to speak on the subject of trade, something I worked on as parliamentary secretary to the great member for Abbotsford, probably our best international trade minister in the history of this country.

It is also great giving my first speech after our caucus having grown yesterday. I am very proud that the member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill brings perspective on trade to our caucus that was lost in the government's side, not realizing that trade and security go deeply together. I will keep that in mind in the context of remarks on the comprehensive and progressive agreement for the trans-Pacific partnership, really the TPP-11.

In large part, most of the heavy lifting done on the trans-Pacific partnership deal was done by the Conservative government. Members may realize that during the 2015 election, all the parties, and there were 12 at that time, and the United States had come to an agreement. It was quite unusual for that to happen. However, unlike what the leader of the Green Party suggested, when there is an international agreement like that, we cannot ask them to wait until our election is over. We got the deal done in a way that did not pit one industry over another, in a way that Canada was at the table for jobs, not for posturing, not for virtue signalling, not for domestic politics. The Prime Minister and the Liberal Party actually use trade to advance their social agenda for their electorate in Canada while putting hundreds of thousands of jobs on the line. Of the many failures of the government highlighted in its #SummerOfFailure, perhaps the biggest risk it is playing with our economy is what it is doing on our trade agreements.

In the last few years, we have seen countries like Australia, New Zealand, Japan, the Philippines, India—of course the whole world knows about that trip—China, Saudi Arabia, Mexico and the United States all frustrated with Canada.

An hon. member: Italy.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: There is Italy as well. Members are welcome to heckle by yelling out more countries because they are hard to keep track of.

However, we are here to talk about the trans-Pacific partnership, TPP-11, because this represents Canada's reassertion of our role as a Pacific nation and the fact that in the last 50 years the Pacific has generated as much wealth than in the previous 100 years.

I had the honour as parliamentary secretary to go on the ground along with Senator Yonah Martin and Barry Devolin, the former MP for Kawartha Lakes, to help secure the final stages of our free trade agreement with South Korea. Now, it is not part of the TPP, but that was our first free trade agreement in Asia. It recognizes that Canada is a Pacific nation.

As the middle class grows in Asia, it is demanding the world's best agricultural products from our country: beef, pork, grain and oil seeds. We are world leaders and Canada is trusted for our high-quality product. My riding's name is Durham, but when world agriculture thinks of durum, it does not think of my riding. It thinks of the wheat developed in Canada. We have been innovators, and our farming families are some of our most committed Canadians to our economy. These trade deals from South Korea to TPP recognize that.

The trans-Pacific partnership with the 11 countries represents almost 500 million consumers. Let us see the wealth that is developed there. China has gone from a country that was considered impoverished 40 years or 50 years ago to being a world-leading economy, the number two economy. I was shocked by the fact that following the Korean War, in which over 500 Canadians died serving and which forged our relationship with that important Asian friend and country, South Korea was one of the largest recipients of food aid. The actions of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and our allies has led to prosperity in that country through security and trade and today it is one of the largest net donors to food aid around the world. In 50 years to 60 years, it is remarkable to go from one of the most impoverished to one of the most successful countries, as well as an ally we can count on.

● (1515)

That is what trade can do. That is what working on trade and security together can do. That is why the member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, after three years of banging her head against the wall in a government that is about platitudes and photographs of its leader, of neglecting our trade relationships or insulting our foreign allies and friends, and of withering away the prosperity that Canada enjoys, is sitting on this side.

With TPP we have the ability to access a combined GDP in these countries of almost $14 trillion. As I said at the outset, under the Harper government, many of our trade deals were centred around the importance of our agricultural sectors and industries. This is going to be part of the case. As I said, this will have us accessing markets that are growing, the prosperity that is growing in Vietnam, for example, one of the countries, and in Japan, the world's third-largest economy. They have a high demand for our pork, beef and grains. They are going to see tariff rates reduced. In 10 to 15 years, all tariffs will be reduced off of pork and beef, for instance.

If members go to Seoul, like I did, they will try Korean barbecue. Koreans love pork and beef, and they prefer that it be Canadian. By getting in there when we did, we were able to compete on an even playing ground with Australia and the United States. Our product always wins. We just need fair access.

Wheat and barley will see tariff reductions almost immediately, and canola will see reductions within five years. There will be huge wins for our agricultural sectors.

Representing part of Oshawa, and being the son of someone who worked more than 33 years at General Motors, there have been some concerns on auto. I would refer some of the people who have these concerns to the fact that we have a global supply chain for the auto industry. In fact, the globalization of the auto industry started with Canada and the U.S., with the Auto Pact in 1965, where a vehicle rolling off the line in Oshawa was treated as domestic and tariff-free if sold in the United States.

Since then, since the 1960s, 80% of the vehicles we have assembled in Canada have been sold in the United States, yet the minister did not even mention the auto industry in the NAFTA priority speeches. In fact, the Liberals took six months to put proposals forward on auto. That was a huge failure, and six months were squandered.

Diversification and the trans-Pacific partnership are making sure that our auto parts suppliers and auto companies are competitive and have access to those markets. If there is going to be capital investment and Mexico, our NAFTA partner, is part of the trans-Pacific partnership and we are not, where do members think more investment from global automakers, from auto parts companies will go? It will go to the country that has the best access tariff-free around the world.

We need to be at the table. Forty-five per cent of the vehicles made within the TPP countries, the 11 countries, need to be assembled by the member countries, one of those 11 countries. We need to be part of that.

Who supports that? One of our leading executives, the CEO of Linamar, one of our biggest auto parts companies supports TPP. I will quote what she said:

> Perhaps those opposing TPP are afraid of global competition; I am not. I don't agree that it will be a negative for the auto sector.
>
> On the parts side folks are worried about competition from Asia, but I say we have to be competitive on a global basis and will do so based on efficiency, innovation and great products.

Linda Hasenfratz is one of our leading executives. There are companies like hers and companies like Magna. There are some of our global automakers, like Toyota and others, that are assembling in Canada. Toyota has its Canadian parts distribution plant in Clarington in my riding. This is a global industry.

I am glad to see the Liberal Party has signed on to our approach on TPP. I am still a bit confused by the NDP's approach. Conservatives will always stand up and fight for access for our world-class manufacturers, our world-class auto industry and our world-class farmers.

● (1520)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Whitby, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I sat through the debate yesterday and today on this particular issue. I heard the member for Essex specifically point to me as the member for Whitby and express her chagrin about the CPTPP and what will happen to the auto sector.

Yesterday as well as today, the member for Durham spoke about the confidence he has, much like our government has, in the auto sector, in its competitiveness and ability to compete in a global market. I wonder if the member opposite could talk about Durham region, GM being in our neck of the woods, and how with this particular trade deal we can continue to be competitive and do well for Canadians and particularly residents in Durham region.

● (1525)

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Whitby for bringing the debate home to Durham. We are neighbour ridings.

She knows the former member for her riding, the late Jim Flaherty, worked closely with Stephen Harper to save the auto industry in Canada. It was a tough time, and for Conservatives it was a tough decision, but it was a temporary measure to make sure that GM and Chrysler survived, because the hundreds of thousands of jobs that trickle out to the auto parts industry are critical. These are important jobs, whether it is auto plant workers or GM retirees in Whitby, in Oshawa, or in Durham.

As I said at the outset, since 1965, we have always produced export, mainly to the United States, but we started a very serious diversification effort under the last Conservative government. It is very good that was done now that we have President Trump in the United States, who is protectionist. We will continue to do that.

Linamar, Martinrea and Magna are world-class auto parts and auto companies. We can compete; we have competed and we will compete.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am quite pleased to hear Liberals and Conservatives talking today about the importance of auto jobs. However, unfortunately in the field they are not listening to the auto sector itself, which is saying not to sign the CPTPP because it will harm jobs in Canada. This is not me as the member for Essex or the NDP who are asking this; it is actually the people they are claiming to represent. If they are not listening to those in the exact sector they represent, to those whose jobs will be lost in their community, then I do not know how they have the nerve to stand in the House and talk about auto in a way that says they are representing it.

Auto is in the crosshairs in NAFTA and in the potential 25% tariffs. I ask the member, why are you not standing up for auto workers and standing against the CPTPP?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Again, I just want to remind the member she is to address the chair and not the individuals themselves.

The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I would turn that around. Is the member for Essex somehow discounting the auto workers that work in Woodstock, or Cambridge at Toyota? Is she somehow discounting the jobs in Alliston? Is she somehow suggesting that the auto parts and auto assembly business worldwide is not global when some of the largest investments in recent years in Ontario, many of them unionized jobs, have been from global automakers?

The NDP briefly in the last Parliament supported the South Korean trade deal. I think it was the first time in history. The light shone through the stained glass here. It was remarkable. Now it seems the NDP has gone back to suggesting that the jobs for Toyota workers or Honda workers do not count. I will fight for workers in Windsor and Essex, in Oshawa, in Oakville, in Cambridge. We are world class. We will win, and we need access to those markets.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what a privilege and pleasure it is to rise on such an important issue as international trade. I have been listening to the debate, both yesterday and today, without too many surprises. I recognize and appreciate very much the Conservative Party's position with respect to supporting the government and recognizing the importance of passing this legislation by supporting the time allocation motion that was brought forward.

I am not surprised that the NDP have continued to fight anything to do with trade agreements, and I will try to provide some further comment on that. However, as we have heard a lot about details, numbers, and so forth, I would first like to highlight what I believe is important for this House, the viewers, and the people who might be following the debate to recognize.

Since day one, it has been this Prime Minister's number one goal and objective to fight for Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it. I would suggest that looking at the world markets and the potential they have for Canada with respect to increasing our quality of life and number of jobs is something we cannot work hard enough to achieve, because of the type of potential that is there.

I believe we could do so much more, and we have a government that is committed to doing more. Since day one, ministers have put the trade file front and centre as we try to ensure we are creating opportunities while working with Canadians, business, stakeholders, labour and so forth to enhance the opportunities abroad. The bottom line is that it is working.

Throughout these discussions and debates over the last two and a half years, we have seen a lot of agreements signed. Many Canadians might not be aware of how many countries are involved with the EU trade agreement in particular. There are some 25 plus countries, plus Ukraine, plus legislation dealing with the World Trade Organization. All those agreements and all those sign-offs that have occurred during this administration, along with the support from many other initiatives, have led to the generation of over a half million additional jobs in the Canadian economy today.

We are very fortunate and blessed to have such a skilled workforce. As has been pointed out by some in this House, whether it is the automobile industry or the agriculture industry, we have the best workers in the world. I believe the CPTPP is an agreement that will secure markets into the future.

Whenever I have the opportunity to talk trade with constituents, I try to explain how I see trade from my perspective. I see it as something that is absolutely critical to Canada's middle class, and I will attempt to try to explain it in the best way I know. At the end of the day, trade provides employment in a very tangible way, and I would like to give a couple of examples.

About 18 months ago I had an opportunity to go out to Neepawa, Manitoba. HyLife Foods LP is there, which produces pork. At that time, at least 95% of all the pork leaving the plant was going abroad, to Asia. That is a significant amount of pork. To put it in terms of jobs, we are talking about hundreds, not dozens, of direct jobs in the relatively small but beautiful community of Neepawa. That's just the direct jobs, those individuals who show up on the plant floor every day, and it is a market that is growing.

● (1530)

After we look at those direct jobs, we have to think about the indirect jobs. Those hundreds of employees are consumers of automobiles, housing and food. They are engaged in the communities. They are adding to the social fibre of that particular community.

Let us think about it in the sense that if not for those workers and their contribution to Manitoba's or Neepawa's or indeed Canada's economy, we would have lost a significant portion of Canada's overall GDP.

The example I am giving of Neepawa is taking place all over our country. These jobs are critically important. If not for trade, we would not have those jobs. Canada is a trading nation. We need to have markets abroad. This is a significant agreement; we are talking about over 500 million additional consumers. We are talking about a significant number of people.

When we can assist, by securing markets and by having something on paper, that is a positive thing for communities like Neepawa, and for businesses like HyLife that want to be able to continue to expand and employ more individuals. There are not only those direct jobs, but also those indirect jobs.

That was around 18 months ago, and I might be off by a month or two. I would think all members of Parliament would be familiar with a company called Canada Goose. Canada Goose is a world-class business that exports winter apparel, the best in the world. I think they now have three factories established. I am very glad that the latest addition to the Canada Goose family is in the heart of Winnipeg North, the area I represent. There will be hundreds of additional jobs as a direct result of that expansion. I think it is around 700, but I am not 100% sure on the actual numbers.

Here we have a first-class, world-quality product that is being manufactured in Canada and is employing hundreds of people. They too need those export markets. Those export markets are what allow companies such as HyLife and Canada Goose to look to the future and see ongoing growth. To me, that is what world trade is really all about.

As legislators, we should not be fearful of trade. This is where we differ from New Democrats. I listen. I have listened to many speeches from New Democrats on trade. They do not support trade. If it was up to the NDP, we would still have hundreds of horse-drawn buggies being manufactured in Canada. They just do not want to advance the economy. They do not seem to understand that the world is changing. Technology causes change. There are jobs that will be generated.

The proof is in the pudding. We have a Prime Minister, a cabinet, and Liberal government members who are saying we believe in Canadians and we want to invest in Canada, whether it is through infrastructure or social programming.

At the end of the day, we understand that if strength is added to Canada's middle class, we are really allowing the economy to be healthier and stronger. When we have a healthy, educated citizenship, and as we move and strive to improve upon that, we will see that our companies here in Canada are the best in the world. All we have to do is ensure that we get them the markets, and we will continue to prosper well into the future.

● (1535)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is good to have my colleague back. I sure missed him over the last three months, and I know I am going to miss him even more after 2019 when I will not be able to see him in this place again. All in good fun. I hope he will be campaigning in my riding as well.

In the context of the trans-Pacific partnership, when we talk about the opportunities that exist for increasing trade in the Asia-Pacific area, one of those opportunities involves strengthening exports of our energy resources to our partners in the Asia-Pacific area. However, the government has shown time and time again an inability to make progress when it comes to proceeding with pipelines.

When will we finally see the Liberals' plan to actually get pipelines built in this country?

● (1540)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it is truly amazing to what degree the current Conservative opposition members seem to worship the ground Stephen Harper walks on. Even at the mention of his name, they will often clap because they believe that Stephen Harper was the best prime minister and the one they want to emulate. We see that in their current leadership. There is no difference. When we look at what Stephen Harper did in terms of pipelines, it was not a positive thing for Canada, in particular the province of Alberta.

The Conservatives did not get one inch of pipeline to the Pacific market in over 10 years. We finally have a government that is prepared to ensure we will get that. When it came time for us to acquire the assets, members opposed it. If it were Stephen Harper or their current leader, we know that the pipeline would never happen, but Albertans and all Canadians know we have a Prime Minister who is committed to expanding the market to Asia also.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Madam Speaker, did I really hear my colleague opposite say that if there were only New Democrats, we would still be going around doing business with horse-drawn carts? Is that really how you understand our concerns? That is abysmal. Allow me to officially insult you and to call you a blowhard and a moron. I will apologize later, but I am telling you what I think. I am happy that the Speaker was not listening at that precise moment.

It is pathetic to see you depicting yourselves as heroes by stating that you negotiated perfectly—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. The member must address his comments or questions to the Chair and not the parties or individuals.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Madam Speaker, I apologize.

How many times have we decried the fact that the public was kept in the dark about these negotiations? I had to learn, because I am not an expert. The purpose of debate is to learn and move forward. We are in Parliament.

How is it that in the United States the two main parties are represented in the negotiations? This helps us better understand the complicated issues surrounding this agreement.

How come you never allowed anyone outside your sacrosanct government to be there?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Once again, I remind the member, who has been in Parliament for a number of years, that he must address his questions and comments through the Chair and not to parties or individuals.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the reality is that the New Democrats do not support trade agreements. The NDP members opposed the CPTPP before there were any details. They did not know anything about the trade agreement and they opposed it. They have absolutely no credibility in terms of what is good or bad within it, for the simple reason that they opposed it before the details was known.

No matter what would have been put into the legislation, they had full intentions to oppose it. That is consistent with what they have done in the past. They do not realize that by having trade agreements we provide the opportunity for businesses and other stakeholders to secure markets into the future.

Whether the member wants to agree or not, we live in a world that goes beyond Canada's borders. If we want to enhance and give strength to Canada's economy in the future, trade has to be included. If trade is not included, it is at a huge cost to Canadians. We would encourage the NDP to recognize that trade is a good thing.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before I announce the next speaker, I just want to remind individuals that this is a very passionate debate that is affecting us quite a bit and that people are putting a lot into their comments, but when someone else has the floor, we do expect members to respect that person and not to yell across the floor.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

● (1545)

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to debate this important legislation. Conservatives support free trade and expanding our markets. The Conservative record speaks for itself.

During our time in office we negotiated trade deals with 53 countries, including Peru, Colombia, Jordan, Panama, Honduras, South Korea, Ukraine, as well as the original signatories of the trans-Pacific partnership and the 28 countries of the Canada-Europe trade deal.

Conservatives support trade because we know how important it is for our constituents, for our industries, for our agricultural industry and for our Canadian farmers.

I am glad that we are finally debating Bill C-79, but I have to wonder why it has taken so long for the government to finally act on the CPTPP. After all, back in June it was the Conservatives who offered to have the bill fast-tracked at all stages so that Canada could be one of the first countries to ratify the CPTPP.

Back in July, it was our leader, the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, who wrote to the Prime Minister strongly encouraging him to bring back Parliament during the summer so that we could work here to get the bill passed so that all Canadians could enjoy the benefits of this important trade deal. After all, this trade deal was originally negotiated by our government. We have to give credit to those who have done the hard work, the heavy lifting, to get the TPP to the finish line.

An hon. member: The member for Abbotsford.

Mr. John Nater: That is right. It was the member for Abbotsford. He worked during an election campaign to ensure that all Canadians would enjoy the benefits of the trans-Pacific partnership.

The very first statement I made in the House, the very first issue I raised in the House in response to the Speech from the Throne, was to encourage the government to ratify the trans-Pacific partnership at the absolute earliest convenience. The government did not do it at the time.

Why is the trans-Pacific partnership important now? We are currently living in an uncertain trading situation. We as Canadians have enjoyed a long and important trading relationship with our friends south of the border. Twenty per cent of our GDP is linked to our trading relationship with our friends in the United States. This year alone, from January to July, $252 billion of our exports went to the United States, representing approximately 75% of our nation's outputs.

Over the summer, like many of my Conservative colleagues, I spoke to many local businesses in my and neighbouring ridings to hear their concerns. The businesses and the people I spoke with are concerned. They are concerned about what tariffs are doing to their businesses. They are concerned about how the costs of the tariffs on steel and aluminum are affecting how they do business. They are concerned about how those costs are being passed on to their consumers and the challenges they are having in negotiating with their suppliers and the terms they are getting with their suppliers.

It is a concern that I hear from small businesses, from farmers and from farm families. I hear it from those in the supply managed sector and those in non-supply managed commodities. My constituents and Canadians across this country are concerned about the uncertainty in the Canada-U.S. relationship and with NAFTA. This is why more than ever we need to be diversifying our markets, which is why when our Conservative government was in office those 53 countries were essential to that progress and why it is now important that we must ratify the CPTPP.

The 11 countries that make up the CPTPP account for a $10 trillion contribution to the global economy, or approximately 13% of the global economy.

As a country, Canada must be one of the first six to ratify this deal so that we can enjoy the benefits of the first-mover countries. We need those benefits. Our farmers, our farm families, our manufacturers, our exporters, our small businesses need to be able to enjoy the benefits associated with the trans-Pacific partnership.

● (1550)

What are some of those benefits? One example is that Australia will eliminate all of its tariffs on agriculture and agri-food products upon the agreement's coming into force, except for one tariff line, which will be eliminated within four years. Some have asked me what that one tariff line is. It is bamboo shoots. For those Canadians who are currently growing bamboo shoots, they will have to wait four years for that to come into force, but I am sure that Canada will have a strong bamboo economy within four years for exports to Australia.

In Perth—Wellington, there is a strong pork industry, a strong beef industry and certainly a strong grains and oil seeds industry. Japan's tariffs are currently up to 20% on pork products, including sausages, and will be eliminated within 10 years. Vietnam has tariffs of up to 27%, which will be eliminated within nine years. For beef, Japanese tariffs of up to 38.5% will be reduced to 9% within 15 years. In Vietnam, tariffs of up to 31% on fresh and chilled frozen beef will be eliminated within two years and tariffs of up to 34% on all other beef products will be eliminated within seven years.

For wheat and barley, Japan will have a specific quota for food wheat of approximately 40,000 tonnes, growing to 53,000 tonnes within six years. We will also have access to CPTPP-wide quota for food barley, which starts at 25,000 tonnes and grows to 65,000 tonnes within eight years. These are the kinds of benefits that Canadian farmers, farm families and exporters can enjoy with an implemented trans-Pacific partnership.

It is not just Conservatives singing the praises of the trans-Pacific partnership and the work that was done by the former Conservative government, but industry leaders within the agriculture industry as well. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture said:

> Joining the CPTPP will open unprecedented new markets for Canadian farmers producing export-oriented goods, such as red meats, grains and oil seeds.

When I think of my riding, one of the biggest industries from an agriculture standpoint is the pork industry. The Canadian Pork Council chair stated:

> This deal will provide our industry stability in vital markets like Japan and opportunities in emerging markets like Vietnam. Canadian pork producers can rest easy knowing that their livelihood and that of thousands other Canadians in rural and urban communities who work in the pork industry is supported by this newest trade deal.

When the original trans-Pacific partnership was signed, Mark Brock, a constituent of mine, then chair of the Grain Farmers of Ontario, said:

> Japan is our largest market for food-grade soybeans, and countries like Malaysia and Vietnam have fast-growing GDPs and are major markets for both food-grade and crush soybeans. With market development a key pillar of our organization, improved access to these important export countries is a great success for our farmer-members.

This is the focus of us in the opposition. This is our focus on the need to expand our markets to ensure that Canadians have access to a growing global market. We need to have access not just for Canadian industries but also for the advancement of all Canadians to ensure that we can enjoy the benefits of up to $20 billion in the next 10 years from the original TPP deal, and yet we see delay after delay in finally getting this deal ratified.

As I mentioned earlier, we offered to have this fast-tracked in June. That was denied. We offered to come back to the House in July to debate this bill during the summer to ensure that we were one of the first six countries to ratify it. That did not happen. We as Conservatives will support trade, we will support good trade deals, and now, more than ever, with the uncertainty south of the border, we need to continue to work hard to diversify our trading relationships to ensure that we access the Asia-Pacific markets for our pork industry, our beef industry, our grains industry, for those farmers, farm families and industry leaders who need that access.

I am very pleased to speak in favour of the trans-Pacific partnership. I hope we will see this pass at second reading quickly, go to committee and return to the House for third reading in the near future.

● (1555)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secret ry to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is with great interest that I hear the Conservatives suddenly interested in efficiency in the House and moving forward on critical issues that are important to Canada's economy.

I wonder where that efficiency, that desire to get legislation through the House, was last June when there was procedural game after procedural game, 24-hour voting marathons, and all kinds of procedural delays, including adjournment motions. Everything but the order of the country was being dealt with. All we were doing was playing into some sort of dramatic presentation of frustration by a party that has never quite understood that it lost an election. It reminds me of the provincial legislature right now in Ontario that had to be called back to immediately deal with something, only then to sit aside for two days for them to go to a plowing match instead of dealing with the issue the Conservatives thought was so important they had to override the charter.

Is the party opposite turning over a new leaf? Is it now going to start supporting our government's agenda in a coherent way, in a mature way, and start participating in building a stronger country, or is this just another charade?

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, I am proud of the International Plowing Match. I am proud of our strong rural economy. I will have that member know that over 100,000 people attend the International Plowing Match annually. I know the millions of dollars that the IPM has brought into my riding when we hosted it near Harrison a couple of years ago. I know that 100,000 people attended the IPM in my neighbouring riding of Huron—Bruce last year. I know of the importance of our strong rural economy and how much the agricultural sector contributes to that economy.

I will have the member for Spadina—Fort York know that our farmers are the best in the world. They quite literally feed the world, and to hear the condescending attitude of that member towards the agricultural industry, towards the International Plowing Match and all that our farmers and farm families contribute to this world is disgraceful. That member should be ashamed of himself.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am quite happy to hear my colleague speak with such passion about farmers, because I also have a passion for the farmers not only in my riding but across Canada. I actually was the winner of the Essex County Ploughing Match this year and I am quite proud of that.

I spent Friday night with families from the supply-managed sector until very late at night in my riding office. They feel betrayed by the CPTPP, by what is on the table in NAFTA, and by what happened with CETA. They see themselves constantly being put on the table. They have a government that continues to bafflegab about protecting them while giving up portions of farm families' market left, right and centre, as though those families cannot see what the government is doing.

Unfortunately, it was the Conservative government that negotiated this deal before, which gives up percentages of supply management. Therefore, while I appreciate that the member speaks passionately about farm families, I would ask him why the farmers in the supply-managed sector are once again under attack in the CPTPP and how he can defend farmers when he will vote for this deal that will harm farm families in Canada.

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, I congratulate the member for Essex for her first place finish in the plowing match. I, unfortunately, got second place this year in the Perth County Plowing Match and so I do have room for improvement next year.

Perth—Wellington has more dairy farmers than any other electoral district in this country, and so I am well aware of the concerns of our dairy industry. In fact, if the member reads the comments of Wally Smith when he was president of the Dairy Farmers of Canada following the original TPP negotiation, he was concerned. He did offer his concerns that there was a market access, but he was supportive of the Conservative government's efforts of the day to defend supply management for a generation. There was a comprehensive package available for farmers, for the industry, to transition.

Going forward, we do have the uncertainty with NAFTA, we do have the uncertainty in the negotiations with President Trump, but in this Conservative Party we have defended supply management since our founding. It is in our policy declaration, and I, as a Canadian, I, as a son-in-law of retired dairy farmers, will stand up for our dairy industry and for those in supply-managed commodities and non-supply-managed commodities because it is in the best interests of our Canadian economy.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is great to be talking about trade and TPP, or CPTPP. I call it TPP because it is just easier. Actually, that is really what it is: an agreement that we, the Conservatives, developed, worked on and prepared a letter of intent. We gave it to the Liberals with a bow tied around it, and three years later we are actually going through the process of ratifying it.

I want to give a little history on TPP, exactly how it came about and what the intent was behind it.

If we go back a few years to 2014 and 2015, like-minded countries came together and said that rules needed to be created in the Asia-Pacific region that all countries would follow. It was a way to ensure proper rules were in place so countries like China and India would not bully other smaller economies in that region. This was a chance to do that.

The other thing that was happening was the chance to modernize NAFTA. Canada, the U.S. and Mexico were all part of the original TPP. They were saying that we could take this, add clients in North America, and this would replace and modernize NAFTA. In fact, if we would have done that, we would not be in this quagmire we are today and we would not have this insecurity in our business community. If the Liberals would have taken the TPP in 2015 when they were elected, instead of stalling and delaying, had embraced it with Obama and put it through, we would not be sitting here today talking about NAFTA and the concerns around it. It is frustrating for farmers, forestry workers and people in the mining and manufacturing sectors because it is three years later. They have been through a lot of stress and hardship in those three years.

This deal is great for Saskatchewan. It is great for our agriculture producers. They are the first to tell us that. They will have preferential access to markets in Japan. The fact that the U.S. is no longer involved makes it even better. Our beef producers can go into Japan with lower tariffs than our American competitors. Our grain growers can go into Japan and Asian markets with a competitive advantage over the Americans. The American farmers are fuming about this. They want to be part of this agreement also. However, because of their choices and their leadership, they are not part of this agreement. We are, so it is very important we are part of the first movers in this agreement to take full advantage of this opportunity.

I was in Japan last January and had a chance to sit down with some of our trade commissioners there. They are great people. Whenever I travelled, I tried to ensure I had a day to talk to different trade commissioners and embassies about the challenges and opportunities Canadian businesses had in that part of the world.

The people in Japan are excited. They talk about forestry products, for example. Our forestry sector is doing relatively okay, but, again, it has this cloud of tariffs and lack of market access into the U.S. The Asian market is something new to these people of which they can really take advantage. Our trade commissioner is saying that there is a huge opportunity for them to sell lumber and lumber products into Japan. Again, having that tariff-free access into the market is going to benefit that sector and help pivot away from the U.S. It will provide more security and stability in those communities with lumber as their main occupation.

When we look at the beef producers, Japan has huge trading houses. They do not just trade in Japan; they trade all over Asia. When producers are selling to these trading houses, their product becomes part of the mix in components put out for sale in different areas in Asia. For example, if one is selling beef steaks to go into TV dinners, it will be Canadian beef going across Asia, through these Japanese trading houses, feeding people across Asia. That is an advantage our beef producers will have that our American producers across the line will not.

When we talk about the Japanese business community, it is very loyal. Once someone is involved with the Japanese, once a proper relationship has been established with them, it is almost for life. They want to deal with those people over and over again. All of a sudden price is not the biggest issue anymore. They want quality. They want things we can deliver out of Canada. That is the advantage of having that tariff-free access and being the first mover.

That was why we needed to have this agreement come forward three years ago. It was why we should have had this agreement last spring. It is really disappointing that the Liberals would have rather done marijuana legislation than legislation that would have such a positive impact on our economy across Canada. At least we are here today. I give the government credit for making it the top priority, because we have to provide some stability for our business community and some new markets for them to sell into.

● (1600)

We have to remember that the Liberal government has not been very successful when it comes to trade files, when it comes to foreign policy. When the Liberals said that Canada was back, the reality is that years later we are not back. In fact, we are viewed as something other than what we were in the previous Harper government. This is a chance for us to go back into the marketplace, exert our great products and compete on a level playing field.

When I had round tables this summer, I talked to many manufacturers and agricultural producers. One of the things they talked about was competitiveness. We need to have a debate in the House about competitiveness. We need to really understand what has happened to our sectors and the impact that regulations and taxation like carbon taxes has had on them and their ability to compete, not only in North America but around the world.

When we start imposing taxes and regulations in Canada that shut down our industries, those products are being replaced by products in other parts of the world that do not have the same regulations and taxes. Those products will not have the same environmental benefits we have in Canada. We should be selling more goods, building more things because our environmental standards are so high compared to other regions in the world. We should be exporting like crazy because it is better for the global environment if we do it here than in a third world country.

However, the government wants to penalize our manufacturers and the different sectors. It views them as something bad, but they are our global strength. We should be embracing and working with them to ensure they have all the opportunities to sell their products and goods around the world, not beat them up. The government is doing nothing but beating them up, calling them tax cheats and all different kinds of names, undermining them through tax code changes and lack of consultations. Those things have to stop. Our business community cannot afford it.

When I talk to the business community, I am very scared. Businesses are not talking about expanding in Canada. Any thought of expansion in Canada is on hold. If they are going to expand, it is going to be in Tennessee or elsewhere in the U.S. where there are all sorts of incentives and tax breaks, an environment that actually wants their business, that wants them to grow there. We do not have that atmosphere in Canada anymore. We have an atmosphere where business is viewed as something that is evil. That is wrong and it has to change.

Hopefully the government will understand that by getting a trade agreement it opens up market access. That is really good. However, if we do not give our businesses, companies and farmers a level playing field through taxation and regulation, what good is it? They cannot compete because we have made them uncompetitive. Those are the issues we have to address. The Liberals cannot say that they passed the trade agreement, everything is good and go back and eat Cheerios. The trade agreement is just the first step.

The Liberals need to go to work and help people open up markets. They need to use our trade commissioners and trade services to ensure they understand what markets are available to them. We have to ensure we have EDC and BDC in place to help them expand their operations in Canada to grow the market. We need to help them with business plans in areas where they do not understand how business is done. We have those professionals within the bureaucracy. We need to leverage those professionals and ensure they have the tools to do what they need to do. We have to ensure the business community understands that those tools are there and are available.

This is a good agreement. It has some flaws. One of the biggest flaws is it should have been done three years ago. Having said that, at least we are doing it now.

I want to compliment the Liberal government for at least doing it now. This is the right thing to do. I am glad it is doing it and I look forward to being part of the trade committee to see this move forward. I look forward to going back to my farmers and forestry workers and telling them that we do not know what is going on the in the U.S., that we are not sure what is happening with NAFTA because Liberals will not tell us, that they are secretive, but at least we have fair and good market access into Asia. They can put resources that pivot toward that market to stabilize their businesses and continue to grow in Canada.

I look forward to seeing the vote on this and seeing this passed. I look forward to going back to farmers and forestry workers and telling them that we have given them another tool in their toolbox to be successful.

● (1605)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Whitby, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for agreeing to vote favourably for the bill. He spoke about it being a rough three years for businesses and how this government needed to level the playing field for businesses.

We reduced the tax rate for small business down to 9%. The Canadian small businesses under our government have created over 500,000 good middle-class jobs that have allowed Canadians to succeed. We have created conditions where there is the lowest unemployment in over forty years. We are investing in families. We have invested $350 million in the dairy industry, which he brought up in his speech, $250 million for technology and equipment and $100 million for modernization.

We are making investments that help create a playing field for businesses to do well, but are also creating the conditions to allow them to expand to other markets and grow their businesses successfully.

● (1610)

Mr. Randy Hoback: Madam Speaker, the stats sound very impressive. However, when we get into the weeds of those stats and how they actually operate and function, they do not mean anything.

When the businesses come to us saying that they are being taxed more and regulated harder than if they were located in the U.S., that is an issue. Businesses see the huge U.S. tax changes last year. When the government says they are not a problem, but the business community says that it is a huge problem, then we have an issue.

When the government starts calling our business owners tax cheats, we have a problem. When it changes the structure in which business owners operate their businesses so they cannot save for that rainy day or that period of time when there is a downturn in the economy, we have a problem. When it has taken the tools they need to succeed out of their toolbox and then hides them behind some stats and numbers, you have not helped them. You have done more harm than good. That is what you have done as a Liberal government.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member that he is to address his questions and comments to the Chair. Maybe if he would not use the word "you", it would be so much easier.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Essex.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague is on the trade committee. We have sat there since the election and I have enjoyed our time there. He, like I, spent a very long time travelling with the trade committee across Canada. We heard from over 400 witnesses on the original TPP. There is very little difference between the CPTPP and what was the original TPP. That is certainly true for the Dairy Farmers of Canada, which when it heard the news that we had signed on to the CPTPP, called it "a sombre day" for the 221,000 Canadians who depended on the dairy sector for their livelihood.

The president of the Dairy Farmers of Canada, Pierre Lampron, stated:

> On the one hand, the Canadian government has repeatedly stated that it wants a vibrant, strong, and growing dairy sector that creates jobs and fosters investments; on the other hand, it continues to carve out pieces of our domestic dairy market, first through CETA, and now through the CPTPP.

It is interested in another thing, and I will ask of my colleague today. I think we all recognize that the dairy sector is present in a majority of our ridings. This is a huge political conversation we are having. Therefore, the Dairy Farmers of Canada is interesting in hearing how MPs will explain these concessions to the dairy community in Canada. That is my question to the member.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hard work of the member on the trade committee. We may not agree on some things, but there are quite a few things on which we do agree. It is actually surprising.

When it comes to the dairy sector, it is a tough problem. Basically, supply management is a problem. In every trade negotiation it comes up.

I give the dairy farmers credit. For example, in CETA, basically for the benefit of the country as a whole, they allowed some market access. They agreed to that providing they had appropriate compensation for it. In TPP it was the same thing. They said that they wanted our beef, grain producers and manufacturers to do well, so if that meant they had to give up a bit of market access, providing they were properly compensated and the the pillars that were required for supply management were maintained, they would live with it. They did not like it, but they would live with it.

What happened when the Liberals took control? They lost the compensation part of the equation. Now the dairy farmers do not know what that scenario looks like. If the Liberals are saying that they will be there for them, they should tell them what that means, because they do not know. They do not understand. That is a fair question and the Liberals owe them an answer to that question.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Whitby, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. I really do support this piece of legislation, particularly because where I come from in Whitby we have a lot of small businesses. We have a lot of middle-class families that depend on the growth and success of their businesses to be be able to provide for their children and to be able to provide for themselves for years to come.

The fact is that the CPTPP allows access to Asia-Pacific markets. It is something that will really benefit not just the people of Whitby or the people of Durham region, but people right across the country.

This particular agreement will open a market to an additional 500 million customers, resulting in 40% of the world economy. This allows us to not be solely reliant on the bulk of our trade going to the United States but opens up those markets and allows our businesses to be able to thrive in other jurisdictions. It is one of the largest free trade agreements in the world with access to a trading bloc of 495 million people, with a combined GDP of over $13.5 trillion. Canadian businesses will get preferential access, market access for our exporters to key markets in the Asia-Pacific region. I think that is critically important.

One of the things that Canadians need to understand about this agreement and one of the things that we want to ensure that Canadians know and Canadian business owners know is that we have full confidence in their ability to grow their businesses and to do well by their customers, and to put forward business plans that allow them to grow. We have seen that over the last three years. We have seen the Canadian economy being the fastest growing in the G7.

Our small businesses have created 500,000 jobs since we have taken office. They are the engine that drives our economy and we are creating even better conditions for them to get their goods and services to market.

We have the lowest unemployment in 40 years. Our middle-class families are seeing and feeling the positive effects of our policies. A family of four right now here in Canada will be receiving $2,000 more in their pockets, so we are seeing the economy doing well. How do we make that better for businesses?

I am going to go back to the previous speaker, who said that it was a tough three years and then he spoke about creating a level playing field for businesses. This government has done that. We reduced the small business tax rate for our businesses down to 9%. We are making sure that there is a level playing field. However, we can and we will do more. We are actively diversifying our trade, which is something that Canadians, when I go to the door in Whitby, are concerned about. They are concerned about NAFTA. They are concerned about steel and aluminum. They want to ensure that this government is taking the steps to not only make things better here on the ground but to also look forward and think how can we make things better. How can we allow our businesses to have access?

I want to talk about a couple of businesses in Whitby specifically. Whitby has a company called Greenwood Mushroom Farm. Not a lot of my riding is rural, but we have a few farms on the north end of the riding and they are really sophisticated, innovative enterprises. Greenwood Mushroom Farm is state-of-the-art facility in north Whitby.

● (1615)

Windmill Farms is the sales, distribution and marketing division of Greenwood Mushroom Farm, one of the largest mushroom-producing companies in Canada. It was built in the early 1960s. It has grown. They have made massive investments, ensuring that they are innovative and staying top-of-the-line. Going through the facility, there is no smell. They have a state-of-the-art compost facility. It is actually remarkable, and I would invite anybody to come to Whitby to tour this fantastic farm.

The reason that I bring up the Greenwood Mushroom Farm, and I could bring up any number of farms in Whitby, is because of the benefits we see for agriculture and agri-food products through the CPTPP. They will benefit from immediate, duty-free treatment of tariffs on many products, to be phased out gradually. This will create, of course, new market opportunities, not just for vegetables and fruits but for other Canadian agriculture and agri-food products, beef and pork, cereals, maple syrup, spirits and a wide range of goods.

I know the owners and people who work at Greenwood Mushroom Farms would appreciate the fact that we are looking at different ways for them to sell their products globally in a competitive way.

Again, this goes back to who is within these organizations. This is not some arbitrary company that is trying to grow. These are Canadian families. These are middle-class families that are trying to do the best they can to work at an organization, to stay competitive, to be able to expand and grow, and do what they need to do for their families.

I would also like to talk about the technology industry. I think many people will be surprised to hear this. In Whitby, we have a number of thriving businesses in our downtown core. We are having an immense revitalization of our downtown. It is becoming a place where people want to hang out. We no longer go to Toronto; we stay in Whitby. There are things to eat and drink, and activities for families. People like to be downtown.

It has the ability to be a place where people live, work and play. There is no longer the need, or we are creating what is no longer the need, for people to go to Toronto to go to work. We have companies like geekspeak that do global work, and companies like 360insights that work in international markets.

Our tech industries are really supportive of the CPTPP, more than the TPP, because of the provisions we negotiated in intellectual property. These are companies of middle-class families. I actually knocked on the doors of the owners of geekspeak. I have seen their children. I know who they are. They want to be able to provide the services that they have taken from a little idea in a basement to a thriving enterprise within downtown Whitby, and to then take it to beyond the global enterprise that they currently have.

It is critically important to understand that our companies want to be able to grow and succeed, and we are giving them the access to do that. We are creating the conditions by which they will be able to grow and succeed.

I would be remiss if I did not speak about the auto sector in Durham region. We have heard from many colleagues in here about the auto sector, and the challenges with NAFTA, with steel, with aluminum. The diversification of our products, goods and services to Asia-Pacific markets will help.

Right now most of our trade goes to the United States. The opportunity to have that go to a market of close to 500 million people will really impact our businesses in a positive way. We have confidence in our businesses. We have confidence in our small businesses. We have created the conditions domestically for them to succeed. We are now creating the conditions for them to succeed internationally.

● (1620)

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the member opposite, but I am very disappointed in her today to not even mention auto, to not talk about the vibrant auto community in Whitby or Oshawa. Unifor Local 222 president Colin James represents 21,000 members. I am talking about the harm to auto, the loss of jobs to auto, how many people will be out of work who will not be able to enjoy Whitby in the way that she described it because of the CPTPP.

The member spoke about the tech industry. I will read a quote from committee, which heard from Jim Balsillie, the former CEO of the Canadian company Research In Motion. He said, "there's nothing in TPP that is specifically advancing any Canadian companies." Canada would be a "colossal loser" under the TPP.

I want to go back to auto. I hope the member has done the work on this, representing auto workers. I would like her to explain to the House the interpretation of the CPTPP rules of origin and the connection to auto jobs being threatened in her riding of Whitby. I will note that the automotive parts manufacturers are predicting 20,000 jobs lost across our supply chain in Ontario.

I would ask her to explain to the House her interpretation of the rules of origin and why she thinks the CPTPP is good for auto.

● (1625)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Madam Speaker, the member opposite started by saying that I did not mention auto. I did mention auto. I said I would be remiss if I did not mention auto at the end of my speech. I do not expect that the member opposite would agree. We have heard from New Democrats for most of today and yesterday that they do not agree with this particular trade agreement. In fact, they do not agree with many trade agreements.

I will talk about tech for a minute. We have made it very clear that we want to negotiate very good deals for Canadians. Our government has been very clear on ensuring that we are making investments in innovation, investments in ensuring that tech companies and other companies have a level playing field to be able to do well and succeed. We have made the necessary provisions within the CPTPP with intellectual property to ensure that they are succeeding.

When it comes to auto, again we need to be clear that our auto manufacturers within Whitby, within Cambridge and across the country, especially in Ontario, are facing challenges with NAFTA, with steel and aluminum. The ability to diversify our markets, to allow them to get their goods and services and auto parts to different markets is necessary. If the New Democrats cannot get on board with that, then I am not sure what they will be able to get on board with.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have been listening to this debate throughout the day and I cannot help but revert back to this idea that the NDP wants nothing to do with trade whatsoever. The reality of the situation is, unfortunately, I guess, for its position, that the world is changing. As we see more globalization and opportunities for businesses to connect to other parts of the world, the reality is that trade is becoming a norm that we have to accept. I really hope that the NDP can, at one point, accept the fact that it is a reality.

I have a question for the member for Whitby. In her comments, she talked quite a bit about what she was seeing in her own community. Could she explain how trade and the trade opportunities that come with an agreement like this will benefit companies and operations within her riding and how they can start to expand into other markets?

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Madam Speaker, one of the reasons we put the CPTPP first on the docket is because we realize the importance of trade. We are a trading nation. When I knocked on doors this summer, many constituents in Whitby were concerned about what is happening with NAFTA, with steel and aluminum. We are demonstrating to the people of Whitby that we are looking at new opportunities to grow their businesses, to give them preferential and duty-free access to an area with over 500 million individuals. Access to those markets is a commitment of this government. This government is demonstrating that we believe strongly in small businesses, we believe in their capacity to expand, and we have confidence in their ability to grow and thrive within the Canadian market and beyond.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Status of Women; the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, The Environment; and the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Foreign Affairs.

● (1630)

[*English*]

Resuming debate, the hon. member for North Island—Powell River.

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is always good to be back in the House. It is good to see all of my colleagues here. I had a wonderful time in my riding of North Island—Powell River spending time with constituents and hearing their concerns. I am sure that most of the members here did the same in their ridings.

I am here today to debate at second reading Bill C-79, which is an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for the trans-Pacific partnership between Canada and 10 other countries: Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. It is very important that we have an opportunity to debate this implementing legislation as the CPTPP is a huge agreement with far-reaching implications for Canadians.

In my riding of North Island—Powell River, there are several businesses that trade internationally. They are good businesses that provide jobs that support people meaningfully. I want to see trade that benefits people, businesses and communities in this wonderful country of Canada.

The other part of living in my riding is the fact that my communities and I have lived through very hard times. I currently am seeing some of those hard times in some of the communities in my riding. An example in the past is when the mill shut down in Campbell River. I saw a lot of people lose their incomes. Soon afterward, some lost their homes. Many had to have one partner travel to another community to work while the remaining family members stayed at home and did their very best to survive. It was really hard as people lost their savings, and in many cases lost their physical and/or mental health.

Losing one's job is absolutely terrifying. It is the very thing that puts food on the table and puts a roof over one's head. When people lose their job and cannot find meaningful employment, it can break so much in their life. I think of a community right now in my riding, Port Alice, which has been waiting several years for the mill to reopen after years of being closed. It is getting to the point that the mayor and council are having to make some very hard decisions about what resources they can have available to the people in their community and what resources they are going to have to shut down. No one wants to be in that position.

I think about Catalyst Paper in Powell River and how the community came together to work so hard. The community, the unions, the mayor and council, the local representative from the province and I fought hard to overturn the countervailing duties. It was a lot of hard work. I really appreciate how hard the community and the business worked together. It was a big relief when those countervailing duties were overturned. However, during that time when so many in the community were unsure of what was going to happen and the community was worried that the mill would be shut down, I got a lot of emails and letters about that and their stress. They shared with me their concern. They wanted to know what it would mean for workers and the community at large. I want to thank everyone again for their amazing work in addressing this issue. It is a very scary situation to be in.

These are but a few of the realities that the people I represent face and are currently facing. With the CPTPP, this is what too many Canadians are facing. Those occupying the 58,000 jobs under threat are facing this type of experience going forward. As parliamentarians, we must take very seriously that the CPTPP threatens to kill thousands of good Canadian jobs. Once these jobs are gone, they are not easily replaced, and when they are replaced, it is often precarious, part-time, and low-wage work, or community members have to leave their community and families behind.

It is the government's job to make sure that when we make opportunities for trade we open more doors rather than close them. Therefore, I hope that as we debate this issue, all parliamentarians keep in mind that the economic analysis conducted by Global Affairs Canada concluded that the CPTPP would generate economic gains for Canada of $4.2 billion. That sounds good, until we realize that this is over a period of 22 years. This is minimal. The sum of $4.2 billion represents the same level of economic output measured as gross domestic product Canada generates in one day. When we hold on one hand 58,000 family-supporting jobs and on the other $4.2 billion over 22 years, I am always going to vote to keep people working.

● (1635)

Some of my constituents have asked what the difference is between the TPP and the CPTPP. Well, besides more letters, I have to point out that there are not many differences. I am very sad to say that it contains the same harmful provisions on auto, dairy, temporary foreign workers, labour mobility, and investor-state dispute settlement. The idea that the TPP was somehow transformed into something progressive is simply not the reality of the text. In fact, it appears to be an attempt to mislead Canadians.

In the communities I represent there are concerns about keeping people in our communities working. This trade agreement would allow companies to bring in temporary foreign workers without a permit process or a study on labour market impacts. Many of my constituents agree with me when I say that if someone comes to Canada as a temporary worker, he or she should be allowed to stay when filling in a long-term job. I am shocked when long-term work is filled in again and again with changing temporary foreign workers. That is simply not temporary work.

When I look at our small communities and the challenges we face to attract and retain people, and as a parent who hopes that her children will settle close to home once their education is done, the ability of businesses to not connect with the local labour market and provide meaningful employment to the people in our communities concerns me deeply. The CPTPP expands these loopholes for companies to do this.

What is also missing from this trade agreement is the complete lack of safeguards in place to guarantee that foreign workers are getting paid what is in their contract with the employer. I spent over eight years working as the executive director of the Immigrant Welcome Centre serving all of north Vancouver Island. It was my job to support newcomers as they came to Canada, and they came in many different ways. Many migrant workers who came to our communities in the region had very positive experiences. There were a rare few who did not. The lack of support for these folks was just appalling. It is very hard to speak up against injustice when the risk to do so is so high. How can this be called a progressive trade agreement when this fundamental right has absolutely no safeguards for implementation? This is a severe gap and something that should be addressed seriously. That this is not being addressed is shameful in a country as great as Canada.

The response by the government to address many of these serious issues is to refer to the side letters. In fact, this is where the Liberals will point to in addressing all of the concerns that the New Democrats have. However, the reality is that these side letters are created with aspirational language that has absolutely zero enforceability. This is a serious problem. This is also where the Liberals point to the so-called progressive elements which carry very little weight compared to the text of the main agreement. Side letters simply cannot supersede the text of the main agreement, and a side letter is not enforceable through the agreement's dispute settlement mechanisms unless it is explicitly mentioned. This is a reality.

I would really like to hear the Liberals address this in a reasonable way. It is time for a meaningful conversation about these issues. Quite frankly, I am tired of simply being accused of being a person who does not support trade at all. What we are asking for is the basic rights of people in this country to be appreciated. We are asking for the meaningful work that supplies families with jobs, that helps them put food on the table, that helps them put their children into school, be respected, and that if something is going to happen, we do not abandon those communities or those sectors but we stand with them and make sure that the outcome is not as terrifying as this trade agreement is setting them up for.

In closing, I look forward to meaningful questions that really talk about this trade agreement. I have a lot of concerns, but my concerns are reflective of so many Canadians out there. What they want to hear are reasonable answers to those concerns.

I look forward to the debate. I know that this is not going to go the way I want it to go, but I want the government to understand that we will bring up the voices of these people every single time, because the workers deserve to be supported and this country could do so much better.

● (1640)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for taking the opportunity to talk about her constituents and in particular those who are experiencing job losses. That can never be an easy thing for somebody to go through and for her to come here and articulate that is extremely important.

She talked a bit about statistics with respect to trade and how she saw it impacting jobs within her community and throughout the country. I am wondering if she has any statistics on the other hand that talk about what the impact would be on Canada should Canada not be part of this particular trade agreement, if Canada chose an approach that the NDP seems to favour more, that of removing itself from trade deals. What would the impact be on Canada in terms of how that would affect us in our relationships and our ability to continue to create jobs, including good jobs in her riding?

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, it is always appropriate for us to stand in the House and speak on behalf of the people we represent and the challenges that they face.

I think about my granny who used to always tell me that if I make a choice that would make other people suffer, then I had better think twice about making that decision. My success would not erase the suffering of others, she told me.

I would first remind the member that it is actually the government's job to make sure that we have the research before us that tells us about the opportunities. The people who are going to potentially lose their jobs, the 58,000 individuals and their families, definitely need to see where their opportunities will come from. They need to see what the benefits will be to them if they lose their positions. I just cannot believe that government members would ever stand in their place and say it is okay if those jobs are lost because maybe an opportunity will be found over here.

The stats are clear: $4.2 billion over 22 years. Tell me how that is going to assure 58,000 people who do not have a job.

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Madam Speaker, I sense through the speech of the hon. member that there was a list of benefits versus disadvantages in the CPTPP agreement. Could she list at least two items that would be of benefit to Canada by signing and going forward with this agreement?

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, it is really important that when we look at trade agreements, we understand that they are opportunities for us to have meaningful conversations with other countries about how we can invigorate all of our economies in a positive way.

There are definitely some positive things to be said about beef and grain for sure but at the same time, like I said earlier, when we are asking one sector to give up everything so that another sector may get a bit more, it is important as a governing body that we remember our responsibilities, that we remember we have taken an oath to make sure that we support families.

The Liberal government has said again and again that it wants to support middle-class families and those that are willing and ready to join the middle class. I want to see those middle-class families get stronger. I want to see those families that are working so hard to join the middle class get stronger, because the more successful people we have in our country, the better it is for all of us. I just do not believe in any way that this trade agreement is going to provide that opportunity.

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member spoke about losing jobs and the risk of the unemployment statistics. The unemployment rate in my home province is 16%.

Ocean Choice International is a company located in my riding that employs hundreds of middle-class workers. This company sees the trade agreement as a good thing. It exports some 100 million pounds of product to 35 different countries. CETA enabled it to increase its volume to that point.

I wonder if the member could comment on why this company should be held back from increasing its volume through this agreement as well.

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, I am in no way saying that we should create trade agreements or not create trade agreements that would block people from opportunities. What I am saying is that one person's or one sector's opportunity is not more important than another. If a person has more but others have a lot less, we have to talk seriously about that. This is the place where we are supposed to do that work and I honour that respectfully.

I am happy for the people in the member's riding, but at the same time I am concerned about the auto sector that is facing a crisis. We cannot ever minimize its experience.

● (1645)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in the House to talk about Bill C-79, which is finally coming to fruition later this afternoon, to ratify the comprehensive and progressive agreement on the trans-Pacific partnership. Unfortunately it is disappointing that it has taken the Liberal government this long to get to this point.

Throughout the parliamentary session, the Conservative Party of Canada has given the Liberals ample opportunities to get this agreement ratified as quickly as possible. I recall earlier this winter, we outlined a process for them to expedite the approval of the CPTPP. Later in the spring, we tabled a motion to ratify the CPTPP immediately. Earlier this summer, the leader of the official opposition put forward a letter to the Prime Minister asking him to ask the Speaker to recall Parliament as quickly possible so we could ratify this agreement. Every single step of the way, the Liberal government and the NDP blocked these opportunities.

I want to emphasize what we potentially could have risked. We may not have been one of the first signatories to this unprecedented trade agreement that would bring Canadian industries, including agriculture and energy, more than 500 million new customers. This is what was at risk. We had to be one of the first six countries to ratify this agreement. Once the first six countries ratify the TPP, it is enacted within 60 days.

Let us put this into perspective. Had we not been, or we may not be yet, one of those first six countries, that is like going to the prom without a date, then asking for a dance once the music has started and everyone's dance card is already full. We would be sitting on the sidelines. It is very difficult to break into those markets once the trade agreements and side agreements are already made.

I have to emphasize through history just how important trade agreements have been. The previous Conservative government realized how important free trade agreements were. Prior to coming to office, Canada had free trade agreements with four countries. Over the 10 years under the previous Conservative government, we signed free trade agreements with more than 50 countries. The Canadian economy has felt the benefits of those free trade agreements in every level of the economy.

The Pacific region continues to experience among the fastest growth in the world. This is an incredible opportunity for Canadian industries, agriculture and energy to be part of the gem of this agreement, Japan, as well as fast and growing lucrative markets like Malaysia and Vietnam. The CPTPP will reduce tariffs in countries that represent 13% of the global economy. That is $10 trillion in GDP. This will create new opportunities and benefits for Canadian businesses, workers and consumers.

The CPTPP has the potential to boost Canadian income by more than $20 billion over the next decade. If we wait, Canadian firms risk losing jobs, opportunities, advantages and certainly will impact their supply lines. We cannot delay this any further. The risk to the Canadian economy is simply too great. We must be among the first countries to ratify this agreement so we can be part of those first opportunities.

That was why we urged the Liberals to table this legislation as soon as possible. That was why earlier this year we outlined a process to expedite the approval process, why we tabled the unanimous motion last spring to ratify the CPTPP and why we asked the Prime Minister to bring this back this summer.

The new and preferential access under the CPTPP is projected to provide Canadian exporters with tariff savings of $428 million a year, with the bulk of those exports coming to Japan at a total of $338 million.

I cannot stress enough how important this agreement is to Canada's agriculture sector and certainly to the farmers, ranchers and food processors in my riding of Foothills. The stakes for Canadian producers are high. They are high because of the damage the Liberal government has done with our foreign affairs and irritating our trusted trading partners.

Our agriculture sector has lost vital trading markets like India for our lentils and pulses and Italy for our durum wheat. Certainly now with NAFTA hanging by a thread, we are at risk of losing the United States, our number one trading partner. At every opportunity, the Liberal government has antagonized the United States administration by constantly tabling progressive social value domestic issues that have nothing to do with an economic agreement.

● (1650)

That is why we are in an incredibly weak negotiating position when it comes to NAFTA, which makes the CPTPP that much more important. We need to ratify this agreement so we would not only have those additional 800 million customers, but also have important leverage in the negotiations with the United States on NAFTA. I cannot express that enough. For example, Japan is Canada's third-largest export market for agri-food products. That amounted to almost $4 billion in trade in 2016 alone. Tariff cuts by Japan and Vietnam over five years could increase our annual exports of canola by $780 million and our beef exports by $380 million and our pork exports by $639 million. That the United States is out of the CPTPP makes those markets that much more lucrative. The opportunities for Canadian agriculture are incredible. With the tariff-free savings, our wheat and barley exports to Japan could go up by $167 million; our pork products by $51 million, our beef by $21 million, and our wood products $32 million.

These products are essential pillars of the economy in my riding of Foothills. The tariff-free access to the markets like Japan would be felt throughout my riding. It would be felt at Cargill meats in High River, which employs 4,000 people; by the farmer in Claresholm; by the farm-implement dealer in Pincher Creek, and certainly by the ranchers in the municipal district of Ranchland. This would be felt in every single corner of my riding.

According to research commissioned by the Canadian Agri-food Trade Alliance, the TPP would increase agri-food exports by $1.84 billion. Not being part of the TPP could cost Canadian agriculture almost $3 billion. There is simply no choice; we have to be part of this agreement. The agri-food sector is the biggest job creator in Canada, creating more than $2.1 million jobs and contributing 6.7% to Canada's GDP. To put that more simply, one in five jobs in Canada and 60% of our country's GDP are directly linked to exports.

As Conservatives, we understand the profound benefits of these free trade agreements. In fact, the TPP was negotiated by the previous Conservative government and very little of the language in the previous agreement has changed compared with what we are seeing here. What has changed is the delay after delay to achieve very minimal wording changes in the title. That has put our Canadian economy at risk for almost nothing.

There are incredible opportunities in the TPP, but unfortunately other opportunities would go unrealized. Not only is Japan looking for a secure supply of agri-food and agricultural products, but also for a secure supply of Canadian energy. It looks to Canada as a place of political stability, a place where it could have a reliable supply. While the trans-Pacific partnership would give us those opportunities, unfortunately the Liberal government has failed to provide the critical infrastructure to ensure that we can get our energy products to market and access those Asian opportunities.

The most critical piece of infrastructure was already approved and ready to go, with the northern gateway pipeline, but the Liberals made a political decision to cancel that pipeline, and now we have seen them bungle a second opportunity with the Trans Mountain expansion. Not only have they bungled that opportunity, but Canadian taxpayers are now on the hook for that pipeline at $4.8 billion and counting.

On the one hand, we have incredible opportunities when it comes to agriculture and agri-food producers across the country, and certainly in my riding of Foothills. On the other hand, I am concerned about those incredible missed opportunities that would help people in our energy sector in Alberta and across the country. Because of mismanagement by the Liberal government, we will not be able to take advantage of those opportunities that would put thousands of people back to work.

● (1655)

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to remind my hon. colleague of the facts. I know he did not intend to mislead the House or Canadians but he tried to say that the new agreement did not have many changes from the previous agreement. I want to set the record straight.

The agreement has been dramatically changed from the previously signed agreement by the Conservative Party. We consulted with Canadians for two years on the previous agreement. There has been so many concerns about the previous agreement and I am proud to say that there have been significant changes.

Does the member not agree with the protections this new agreement has for intellectual property which the previous agreement did not have? Does he not agree with the new upgraded and reformed dispute settlement mechanisms that we have implemented? Does he not agree that we need to protect Canadian culture from foreign takeover?

I look forward to his response.

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, my colleague knows that every expert, including most of the people in this House who have read the new CPTPP, understand that the language is almost identical to what was there before. The labour clause and all of those clauses that he spoke about, the vast majority of those clauses were in there. If he is talking about side letters, side letters are not part of the TPP agreement that is going to be ratified and signed. Those are going to be negotiated and discussed later.

What is here and what is in the TPP was negotiated, the vast majority by the previous Conservative government which understood how important free trade agreements are to the Canadian economy and certainly to build those relationships with our trusted trade partners around the world, which unfortunately the Liberal government is tearing apart piece by piece.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. The NDP has a lot of concerns about the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership. We are especially concerned about job losses in auto manufacturing, agriculture and the poultry industry.

We are also very worried about what the future holds for labour standards and protections enjoyed by workers in a number of countries that are party to this agreement. If those protections are downgraded, forget about progress because it will become extremely difficult to compete with those countries. The labour standards set out in this agreement will not apply unless it can be proven that any violation affecting a worker is in conflict with international trade and has an impact on trade between nations.

How can we sign on to an agreement that blatantly violates the rights of workers in other countries and jeopardizes jobs here at home?

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I am really glad that my colleague from the NDP brought up that question, because I did not have time to address it in my speech. I would like to remind him that the labour chapter in the CPTPP was negotiated by the previous Conservative government and it includes some of the strongest protections for workers of any trade agreement and requires all signatories to adopt and maintain in law and in practice the fundamental labour rights as recognized by the International Labour Organization, including freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, elimination of forced labour, abolition of child labour and the elimination of employment discrimination. Those were all negotiated as part of the previous TPP agreement by the Conservative government.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague from Foothills and I are both Albertans. We are both very much cognizant of how much trade matters to our province. Going back to last spring, the headline in the Financial Post is "Foreign direct investment in Canada plunges to its lowest level in years".

Is there any hope in the TPP agreement that resources from western Canada can get to these markets should the federal government find its way to actually get one of the three pipeline tidewater projects that it inherited built?

● (1700)

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, there are opportunities for our energy products from western Canada to be part of the TPP, but unfortunately, our problem is that the infrastructure is not in place because the Liberals have done such a poor job of this. They like to say that we built no pipelines at tidewater but that is not the case. We built four major pipelines including part of the line 9 reversal, which includes additional capacity to tidewater.

Hon. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak on the subject of trade again. In the 21 years I have been in Parliament I have spoken on numerous occasions on our country's trade agenda. It is critically important, we all know. We are a small population with large natural resources, so foreign trade is extremely important for us.

In the early days, our trade with the U.S.A. was very high. We had a great trade relationship with the U.S.A. with our integrated economies. At that time we were in the opposition and we had a Liberal government in power. The Liberals talk about their trade agenda today, but they moved very slowly. At the time of prime ministers Chrétien and Martin, they did not sign too many trade agreements. They talked a lot about it, but they did not sign any meaningful trade agreements.

Also, during that period of time the NDP was expressing some concern. Let us be very clear. The NDP has always opposed any trade agreement.

Then we recognized the fact that Canada needed to open up its markets and not rely on one market. Henceforth, our government's efforts were directed toward that, with the help of the department of foreign trade and foreign affairs. We have some very excellent public service officers who have had extreme experience in negotiating trade deals. They are non-partisan, and look after the interests of Canada. I want to make that point very clearly, because this government is trying to put their work down as if the public servants in the departments do not know what is good for Canada. The fact of the matter is, when our Conservative government came into power it realized that we needed to push this agenda very strongly. As my colleague has stated about the number of trade agreements we signed, let us not forget how many FIP agreements we signed around the world as well, because FIPA is the first step in going into international trade. The member for Abbotsford, who led the file, worked extremely hard to ensure the groundwork was laid. Let us make it very clear that the groundwork was laid by the Conservatives.

The groundwork for CETA was laid by our government. The groundwork for TPP was laid by our government. NAFTA was, again, the Conservatives under Brian Mulroney. As we go forward, the groundwork for all trade agreements was done by the Conservatives.

Sure enough, when we changed government, the Liberals now recognize that these trade agreements are important. However, as usual, trying to please everyone, they do not look at the bigger picture and were more concerned with other agendas, and less for trade. It was only after the president of the U.S.A. started saying he wanted to renegotiate NAFTA, and with so many conditions, that we now face a situation where we need new markets. Suddenly, the Liberals have woken up. We cannot forget the Prime Minister leaving the other leaders waiting in Vietnam for them to talk about TPP. All the other leaders were there.

We get an idea of what the Liberals are talking about in changing the TPP. We had been negotiating with the same governments for a long period of time. Do they think they have suddenly changed and have started accepting what the Liberal government is trying to say, and that the markets have changed in the TPP? That is nonsense. They have their position. Even though they are tinkering to make it look like it is a Liberal agenda, it was our government that laid the groundwork, and as far as it is concerned, it is delayed again.

With the Trans Mountain pipeline now dropped, getting our resources to tidewater has been delayed and the impact on the economy is very strong. Now we see no pipeline to tidewater, no oil going out, and NAFTA now under challenge.

● (1705)

Now, suddenly, the Liberals have woken up and are saying they need TPP. Before that, if these things had not happened, the government's lacklustre agenda on trade would have been moving very slowly. Therefore, today I will say very clearly that I am very glad to have spoken in the House for 21 years on trade promotion for Canada, and to be the last speaker on this so that we can get this thing going very quickly. We need it implemented so we can get Canadian businesses working.

Indeed, the NDP will always voice concerns about it and talk about job losses. However, the great part of the whole thing is that when the economy moves forward collectively, everybody gains. Even though there might be a slight change in a sector, they will gain over the long term. If we contract our market, then the loss of jobs is far higher than we can anticipate.

Talking about farmers, my colleague sitting next to me is a successful farmer in Alberta, and he is also looking for markets to sell his crop. Therefore, when the NDP members say that the farmers are very worried, I can say that my colleague sitting next to me who is a farmer is not worried. He is looking for the opportunity that will allow him to sell his grain on the world market. This is what Canadian businesses are looking for. Therefore, let us look at the larger picture of what is important for this country. It is important for this country to have good trade agreements, so that Canadian businesses have a level playing field with other countries.

Trade agreements make level playing fields. As we see with China, we have an unlevel playing field. China has its own rules, which are not compatible with ours, and this is why the Chinese are not very keen. Neither were we, as the Conservative government, keen on opening free trade with China, because we have different regulations and systems. However, with other countries, and now with the opening market of Japan and all of these countries, we are looking at the growing economies of the world. We should be part of this growth, so that Canadians can benefit with jobs, jobs, jobs. Therefore, we need a collective approach from the government so that we can move forward.

I have to say one thing. I want to tell you guys here to wake up and smell the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will remind the member that he needs to address his comments and questions to the chair. He has been in the House a lot longer than I have, so he should know the rules by now.

Hon. Deepak Obhrai: I agree, Madam Speaker, and sometimes I get carried away. Nevertheless, let us get this moving forward fast, because this is good for Canada.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this government has been moving quite quickly on the whole trade file. Within months, we had the signing of the agreement between Canada and Ukraine. Do members remember the Canada-European Union agreement, the one that was off the tracks? It was this government that got it back on track, and with those 25 plus nations we actually got it signed off. Do members remember the World Trade Organization legislation that we had that enhanced and enabled additional trade? Liberals understand the importance of trade and the impact it has on Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it. That is why it is such a high priority for this government.

Here we are talking about the Pacific trade. Once again, Liberals are out front, driving it forward.

We appreciate the Conservatives' support for the proposed legislation, but I wonder if the member across the way can explain why he believes that the NDP members want to oppose it. In fact, they oppose all trade legislation.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

● (1710)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman that he needs to behave. I know that it is a very passionate issue, but the hon. parliamentary secretary had the floor and should have had the respect of the House.

Hon. Deepak Obhrai: Madam Speaker, I remember when my colleague on the other side was sitting over here. The Conservatives were in government. We were talking about the trade agenda. It was the Conservative government that was proposing the agenda very strongly. When the member was sitting over here, I remember him opposing all of those things and saying to go slow. Today, he is standing up blustering about what the Liberals are doing. I can say that when he was in opposition, he never supported the trade agenda that he is now talking about and that he is going to fight for.

It is great that we are here today. My party is supporting it. I am glad the member's party is supporting it. I say to my friends in the NDP, the TPP is good for Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as a member from Quebec, I really miss the loud fanfare that rang out whenever the Montreal Canadiens won the Stanley Cup. However, when I hear the member for Winnipeg North, it takes me back to those days and I appreciate his loud trumpeting.

Today, however, I find it somewhat disturbing to see how proud the Conservatives are of negotiating such a terrible agreement. Schedule II of the consolidated TPP text states, and I quote:

> Canada reserves the right to adopt or maintain a measure that affects cultural industries and that has the objective of supporting, directly or indirectly, the creation, development or accessibility of Canadian artistic expression or content, except:
>
> (a) discriminatory requirements on service suppliers or investors to make financial contributions for Canadian content development; and
>
> (b) measures restricting the access to on-line foreign audio-visual content.

If I produced Canadian content and if I were in Quebec and producing a series like *Fugueuse*, which has been life-changing for some people, I would be worried.

Is the member for Calgary Forest Lawn reassured by these ridiculous schedules, which are essentially worthless, as demonstrated in the case of Guatemala?

These schedules are supposed to guarantee that we will maintain control of Canadian content on Quebec productions. I hope he can tell me who is to blame, the Conservatives or the Liberals. It makes no difference.

[*English*]

Hon. Deepak Obhrai: Madam Speaker, the member has raised some concerns. He can have a chat with the parliamentary secretary and the Liberals about whatever his concerns are, but here, right now, our party is willing to proceed very quickly, because we know that the TPP is good for Canada. That is why all of us are supporting the agreement.

Mr. Bob Saroya (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Madam Speaker, the TPP was started by the Conservative Party of Canada years back. We did a lot of work on it. I have a simple question for the hon. member. Has the Conservative Party's position changed on the CPTPP and are we still speaking the same language?

Hon. Deepak Obhrai: Madam Speaker, I have said it before and I will say it again very clearly that the Conservatives support the TPP, period.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 5:15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

● (1715)

[*Translation*]

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

● (1745)

[*English*]

The Speaker: The question is on the amendment. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to House*]

● (1755)

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 882)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Aubin
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benson	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau	Cannings
Choquette	Christopherson
Cullen	Davies
Donnelly	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Garrison
Gill	Hardcastle
Hughes	Johns
Julian	Kwan
Laverdière	MacGregor
Malcolmson	Marcil
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Moore
Nantel	Plamondon
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Saganash
Sansoucy	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Thériault
Trudel	Weir — 48

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Allesley
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bains
Barlow	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boissonnault
Bossio	Brassard
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Calkins	Carr
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Chong	Clarke
Cooper	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Eglinski	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus
Finley	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Gallant	Garneau
Genuis	Gerretsen
Gladu	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Harder	Hébert
Hehr	Hoback
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jeneroux	Jordan
Jowhari	Kelly
Kent	Khalid
Khera	Kitchen
Kusie	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leitch
Leslie	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Lukiwski
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)

(Division No. 883)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas	
Albrecht	Aldag	
Alghabra	Alleslev	
Allison	Amos	
Anandasangaree	Anderson	
Arnold	Arseneault	
Arya	Ayoub	
Badawey	Bains	
Barlow	Baylis	
Beech	Bennett	
Benzen	Bergen	
Bernier	Bezan	
Bibeau	Bittle	
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	
Block	Boissonnault	
Bossio	Brassard	
Bratina	Breton	
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes	
Calkins	Carr	
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger	
Champagne	Chen	
Chong	Clarke	
Cooper	Cormier	
Cuzner	Dabrusin	
Damoff	DeCourcey	
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	
Diotte	Doherty	
Dreeshen	Drouin	
Dubourg	Duclos	
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	
Dzerowicz	Easter	
Eglinski	Ehsassi	
El Khoury	Ellis	
Erskine-Smith	Eyking	
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus	
Finley	Finnigan	
Fisher	Fonseca	
Fortier	Fragiskatos	
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)	
Fry	Fuhr	
Gallant	Garneau	
Genuis	Gerretsen	
Gladu	Goldsmith-Jones	
Goodale	Gould	
Graham	Grewal	
Harder	Hébert	
Hehr	Hoback	
Hogg	Holland	
Housefather	Hussen	
Hutchings	Iacono	
Jeneroux	Jordan	
Jowhari	Kelly	
Kent	Khalid	
Khera	Kitchen	
Kusie	Lambropoulos	
Lametti	Lamoureux	
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	
Lefebvre	Leitch	
Leslie	Liepert	
Lightbound	Lloyd	
Lobb	Lockhart	
Long	Longfield	
Ludwig	Lukiwski	
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKenzie	
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	May (Cambridge)	
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman	
McCrimmon	McDonald	
McGuinty	McKay	
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès	
Mendicino	Mihychuk	
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	Morneau	
Morrissey	Motz	
Murray	Nater	
Nault	Nicholson	
Nuttall	Obhrai	
O'Connell	Oliphant	
Oliver	O'Regan	
O'Toole	Ouellette	
Paradis	Peschisolido	
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor	
Philpott	Picard	
Poilievre	Poissant	
Qualtrough	Ratansi	
Rempel	Richards	
Rioux	Robillard	
Rodriguez	Rogers	
Romanado	Rota	
Rudd	Ruimy	
Rusnak	Sahota	
Saini	Sajjan	
Samson	Sangha	
Sarai	Saroya	
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke	
Schmale	Schulte	
Serré	Sgro	
Shanahan	Sheehan	
Shields	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand	
Simms	Sohi	
Sorbara	Sorenson	
Spengemann	Stanton	
Strahl	Stubbs	
Sweet	Tabbara	
Tan	Tassi	
Tilson	Trost	
Trudeau	Vandal	
Vandenbeld	Vaughan	
Vecchio	Viersen	
Virani	Warawa	
Warkentin	Waugh	
Webber	Whalen	
Wilson-Raybould	Wong	
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip	
Young	Yurdiga	
Zahid	Zimmer — 242	

PAIRED

Members

Fortin — Ng — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on the main motion.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1800)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Monsef	Morneau
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nater
Nault	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
O'Toole	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poilievre	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rempel	Richards
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Saroya
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Sorenson
Spengemann	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tilson	Trost
Trudeau	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Vecchio	Viersen
Virani	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga
Zahid	Zimmer — 242

NAYS

Members

Angus	Aubin
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benson	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau	Cannings
Choquette	Christopherson
Cullen	Davies
Donnelly	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Garrison
Gill	Hardcastle
Hughes	Johns
Julian	Kwan
Laverdière	MacGregor
Malcolmson	Marcil
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)	Moore
Nantel	Plamondon
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Saganash
Sansoucy	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Thériault
Trudel	Weir — 48

PAIRED

Members

Fortin	Ng — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on International Trade.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being 6:05 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1805)

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-375, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (presentence report), as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): There being no motions at report stage, the House will now proceed without debate to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

[*English*]

Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, September 19, 2018, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am recognizing that this week is the 40th anniversary of Haven Society, a domestic violence shelter in the riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, which I serve. For 40 years, it has been keeping women and their children safe. It has been reaching out to police and other public safety officials. I believe it is partly because of the great efforts of Haven Society reaching out to the courts and working with lawyers and police officers in every aspect that Nanaimo has one of the lowest rates of unfounded sexual assault findings by the RCMP in the country. We are very proud of Haven's work and I thank it, its staff and volunteers who do such fantastic front-line service, especially the businesses and donors that support them.

● (1810)

As I stand in this Parliament today, I would like to send anniversary greetings to Haven Society, a fantastic domestic violence shelter that has been in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith for 40 years. It keeps women and children safe, and has been at the front line of domestic violence prevention and keeping women sheltered.

It reaches out to the RCMP and the criminal justice system. It works collaboratively with police to identify offenders and help them understand the cycles of violence and the particular aspects of domestic violence that might make women less willing to come forward or respond in a different way under questioning. That sensitivity and that collaboration have resulted in Nanaimo having one of the lowest rates across the country of police findings of "unfounded" in cases of domestic violence.

I thank Haven Society, its front-line workers, its volunteers, and people and businesses in the community that donate and support Haven Society. We are grateful for its work.

In light of the government's commitment to women's equality and the announcements it has made in its budget about its intentions, why has it not yet legislated changes to women's equality that would lead to changes on the ground?

We have heard repeatedly, particularly at the status of women committee, about the cycle of economic impoverishment that starts with pay equity legislation not being in place federally. If women earn less than their partners, they are more likely to drop out of the workforce, and then they cannot afford child care. They may then have several years of interrupted earnings. When they return to the workforce, they are often in precarious part-time work with no access to benefits or unemployment insurance, which means that women in Canada retire in poverty in particularly serious ways.

When is the government going to legislate pay equity? Why has it not yet legislated it? It has had three years, and it was 42 years ago that the first Trudeau government promised it.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to address the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith regarding women's equality in budget 2018 and beyond. I thank her for her good work on the FEWO committee.

Since we were elected in 2015, our government has been committed to gender equality and has taken action. As one of its first actions, the Prime Minister appointed the first-ever gender balanced cabinet and a full Minister of Status of Women.

Our government knows that when we invest in women, we strengthen the economy for everyone. It is not only the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do. By taking steps to advance gender equality, we could add $150 billion to our economy in less than 10 years.

This is why our government reversed the Harper government decisions and restored advocacy as an eligible activity for funding through the women's program. We provided more support to ensure that gender was at the heart of decision-making across the federal government. We also went across Canada and asked Canadians about solutions to gender-based violence in which the hon. member actively participated, and I know is very committed to. This led to the first ever gender-based violence strategy at the federal level in Canada, now with an investment of nearly $200 million.

Building on budget 2017 and its gender statement, budget 2018 reflects our government's continued efforts to advance gender equality by ensuring gender equality is top of mind in the consideration of each and every budget decision.

Budget 2018 includes investments in evidence-based policy capacity and a gender results framework in conversations with young Canadians on gender equality, a national round table on gender-based analysis, a strategy to engage men and boys in advancing gender equality and the sustainability of the women's movement.

Gender equality is a whole-of-government priority. That was why budget 2018 provided support to encourage greater gender equality in the home and in the workplace, with a $1.2 billion investment over five years to introduce a new employment insurance sharing benefit. Introducing this dedicated leave for the second parent will encourage more balanced distribution of caregiving responsibilities and contribute toward a society that recognizes that women and men can and should play equal roles in both paid and unpaid work.

Additional parental leave will give parents more time with their children and give families more flexibility to balance work and family responsibilities.

Budget 2018 also introduced new investments to support women entrepreneurs, additional support for women in the skilled trades and to introduce pay transparency measures in the federally regulated sector. On the hon. member's direct question, we will be introducing proactive pay equity legislation this fall.

Budget 2018 was really a milestone in our history.

Our government is committed to gender equality not only just in words, but also in the solid actions that we have taken to improve the lives of women and men from coast to coast to coast.

● (1815)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, with respect to my colleague on the Liberal side, the gender balanced cabinet, the Status of Women minister, round tables and strategies are all good things, but they are not changing women's lives right now. It is such a huge pent-up demand. With so much good will and words from the government, we really thought that three years into their mandate the Liberals would have made real changes in the lives of everyday women already, but it has not.

This is a strong recommendation coming out of the status of women committee. Employment insurance has not been reformed by the government in a way that helps women. The use it or lose it parental leave that my colleague just mentioned will be a missed opportunity if the government does not expand access to parental leave benefits as too many parents in Canada do not qualify. Six out of 10 workers do not qualify for employment insurance benefits. That means they cannot get the access to leave.

There is still no employment insurance reform that will address anything other than part-time—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, we are changing women's lives with the major investments that we have been making. This spring we were proud to announce $10 million for over 30 projects from coast to coast to coast to increase the economic security and prosperity of women and an additional $5 million for 15 projects across the country to strengthen the economic security and prosperity of indigenous women.

In budget 2018, we also announced that we would introduce legislation to solidify and formalize the role of Status of Women Canada as a full department. We want to ensure that regressive actions like those of the previous Harper government never happen again, because we simply cannot move forward when half of us are held back.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to a question that I asked on April 19. I have to say that the information that has come in since then is even more sobering, and potentially tragic. On April 19 I asked about climate change and how incompatible contemplating buying and building another pipeline would be with the goal of reducing greenhouse gases.

However, I want to read what I said on April 19:

> ...the warnings of climate scientists are becoming increasingly urgent and worrying. The most recent, days ago, was that the world was watching the weakening of the Gulf Stream ocean currents, with potentially catastrophic impacts. The scientists are warning that we must reduce greenhouse gases far more rapidly than our current commitments.

Just yesterday came another report about what is happening with the Gulf Stream and what that means for Atlantic Canada.

I see my friend, now the hon. parliamentary secretary. I commend him for his recent promotion to parliamentary secretary for environment. He represents a riding where I used to live with the impacts of what I am going to now say are devastating for Central Nova.

This is from a recent study published in Nature Climate Change magazine. It is peer reviewed, top-quality science. I never expected to see this: "Rapid coastal de-oxygenation due to ocean circulation shift in the northwest Atlantic", the study indicates, is threatening the survival of all marine life in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence.

The marine ecosystem in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, one of the richest and most biodiverse marine areas on the planet, is now anticipated to be one of the most endangered ecosystems as a result of climate change. Just to paraphrase the study, because I think it is important for parliamentarians to know this, as carbon dioxide levels have risen over the past century due to human emissions, the Gulf Stream has shifted northward and the Labrador Current has weakened. This new study finds that this causes more of the Gulf Stream's warm, salty and oxygen-poor water to enter the Saint Lawrence Seaway. The evidence of science is continually becoming stronger, more urgent and, in fact, clearly saying to policy-makers around the globe that we are in a climate emergency.

We are not dealing with an environmental issue; we are dealing with a security threat. The Gulf of Saint Lawrence is the home of endangered whales. It is also the home of billions of dollars in fisheries' resources that are still successfully and sustainably fished.

If the Gulf of Saint Lawrence is the canary in the coal mine for the collapse of oxygen in the world's oceans, then this parliament should do nothing but debate how we respond to climate change in a meaningful way. We should do nothing but talk about what is needed way beyond the minimal approach to carbon taxes or applying a price to carbon. We should be talking about what is necessary, not what is politically possible, because we are in a climate emergency. All this summer British Columbians know we had 500 wildfires. The people of my constituency and I had trouble breathing because our air quality was worse than Beijing's.

Climate change is a health threat. Climate change is an urgent security issue and, unfortunately, the government continues to pretend that the old Harper target is the Paris target. It is not. We need to be serious as parliamentarians. As grown-ups, it is time we started protecting our children.

● (1820)

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as always, I appreciate the comments from my colleague who represents the people of Saanich—Gulf Islands. I would like to thank her for raising the question and look forward to working with her in my new capacity. I thank her for her congratulations, as well. We have much in common. We are both coastal MPs. We both have experience living in my part of the world, and we are both dedicated to protecting our natural environment.

The threat posed by climate change is real, and the member is correct to assert that we need to be debating not whether it is real but what we are going to do about it. I would like to share with her that when our government funds research at St. Francis Xavier University, which is in my community, I take the time to sit down with the professors whose research we are funding to learn more about the threat posed by climate change and how policy can adapt.

I have to point out that our commitment to protect the environment, in my opinion and the government's opinion, is not at odds with the principle that we can grow our economy as well. We can grow the economy and protect the environment at the same time. In fact, positive developments that protect the environment can in fact help spur economic growth.

For example, the International Energy Agency tells us that implementing the Paris Agreement could boost the global economy by $19 trillion over the next 30 years. I am committed and this government is committed to meeting our Paris Agreement targets.

This tells us that now is the time to be investing in innovation, clean technology and green infrastructure. As we transition to a green economy, we will stimulate clean growth, spark Canadian innovation and entrepreneurship and create good-paying jobs. We can grow the economy and protect the environment at the same time.

Canada moved from seventh to fourth place in a global clean tech innovation index. I know that we can attribute this jump to many Canadians, businesses and individuals, and their willingness to adapt and innovate. Take, for example, General Fusion in the member's own province of British Columbia which is developing a process that could unleash the energy potential of fusion. As well, there is the Squamish-based company, Carbon Engineering, that is developing an innovative technology to capture carbon from the air and produce fuels.

In my own province, we have companies like CarbonCure that is sequestering emissions to make strengthened concrete, and the Trinity Energy Group in Pictou County that is employing people to help make homes more efficient. These examples of innovation in the private sector are made possible by the creativity of people locally, but also with the conditions we are creating to promote clean investments.

Over the next 11 years, the government is investing over $21.9 billion in green infrastructure. We are investing over $20 billion to support urban public transit projects. We are investing over $2 billion over the next 11 years to support the priorities of rural and northern communities. We are investing over $9 billion to support projects that reduce emissions, deliver clean water, manage waste water, build cleaner, better-connected electricity systems, and help communities adapt to climate change.

These investments are in addition to the $1.5 billion we have committed to protect our oceans. During her remarks, the hon. member raised the importance of the gulf region, which is dear to my heart. This commitment is going to go a long way to protect our nature and wildlife that depends on it.

I am proud of these investments and the steps our government is taking to reduce pollution, such as putting a price on carbon, developing policies to reduce methane emissions, and taking steps to reduce pollution from hydrofluorocarbons.

These are serious measures, and I look forward to working with the hon. member opposite, as we have over the past few years, and whom I have great respect for. I sincerely thank for her the opportunity to address her questions.

● (1825)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, It pains me to say this, but the wish list described by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change does not constitute a climate plan sufficient to address what we now face. This is a time that reminds me of what Churchill faced in those five days of May back in 1940 when they told him, and everybody who knew anything about the situation told him, that it was hopeless and that he had better surrender.

This is not a time for fossil fuel appeasement. We cannot pretend we can build more pipelines or expand the oil sands and still meet the threat of the climate crisis. This is a moment when we need a Dunkirk solution. What is a Dunkirk solution? Churchill saw that the entire army was stranded on the beach. There were 300,000 men that they could not rescue from Hitler's force. They had no defences for their island if they should be invaded. Churchill did not give up. He said, "Wait a minute. How many civilian boats are over there in Dover? There are 80,000 civilian boats, you say? Let's marshal those people and get going."

It is clear that we have to do much more—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, if the point the member is making in her follow-up comment is that we need to engage every Canadian from coast to coast to coast on a civilian basis to assist the efforts the government is making, then I agree wholeheartedly.

We can and will put forward measures in this Parliament to help reduce pollution, whether it is methane regulation, hydrofluorocarbons, or putting a price on pollution, and also making investments that are going to grow the economy and make the environment more healthy at the same time.

We share in our desire to promote a healthy environment, and as long as I hold this position or a seat in this House, I will not give up on chasing this honourable aim.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it should be uncontroversial, but Christians are among the most persecuted faith community. Christians face violence and persecution on the basis of their religion in over 60% of countries, by some estimates, and yet we encounter in the House on a regular basis the baffling refusal of the government and its fellow travellers in the political far left to even acknowledge the existence of persecution against Christians. The government is generally absent when it comes to international human rights. Its particular hostility toward the Christian community is evident in its lack of response to this vital issue.

I asked the following question to the Prime Minister at the end of the fall sitting.

> Mr. Speaker, yesterday the foreign affairs minister finally acknowledged genocide of Yazidis at the hands of Daesh in Syria and Iraq. However, the government has yet to acknowledge genocide against Christian communities in the same areas, Assyrian, Chaldean and other Christians who live in communities alongside Yazidis and have often been treated in exactly the same way.
>
> Will the Prime Minister today also acknowledge the Christian victims of this genocide?

That was my question. In response to the question, the Prime Minister refused to acknowledge the genocide of Christians, but he actually also refused to even mention the experience of Christians. He did not even use the word "Christian" in his response. This was not an accident. I have on three previous occasions asked the Minister of Foreign Affairs to recognize the targeting of Yazidis and Christians by Daesh as genocide. She responded in each of these three cases that yes, they are very concerned about the plight of Yazidis, with no mention of Christians and no mention of the experience of Christian victims of genocide.

The government very often gives verbal acknowledgement without action, but in this case, it repeatedly and by all indications intentionally refused to even give verbal acknowledgement to the persecution of Christians. Its disdain is evident. It has chosen either to completely write off Christians in the next election or to simply be blinded by ideology.

What is the ideology at stake? This far left strain of thought I think assigns value to people and their experience based on whether or not they are considered privileged. If we think they have historically been privileged, then we assign less value to their experience, and if we think they have been historically underprivileged then perhaps we care more. So often these so-called privilege points are assigned in total ignorance of the realities on the ground. The left considers Christians to be historically privileged and also mistakenly sees Christian presence in certain parts of the world as a colonial artifact, so they ignore the genuine suffering of the indigenous people of the Middle East and elsewhere who never enjoyed any privilege in any sense.

Advocates for the rights of Christian minorities around the world are not seeking the extension of domestic debates about the role of religion in public life. They are simply trying to respond to the reality of human suffering, human suffering that generally goes unacknowledged and certainly unaddressed by the government. Human suffering is ignored by the government if the victims happen to be Christian.

It goes without saying that Christians are not the only religious minority facing persecution or that merit our attention, but Christians are the ones most likely to be ignored, and that is unacceptable. Canadians deserve better than that from the government. They deserve a foreign policy characterized by an authentic commitment to humanism and pluralism. An authentic commitment to those values would include a willingness to confront human rights abuses that impact anyone regardless of their faith, and even if they are Christian. It is high time the government stopped ignoring the epidemic of anti-Christian violence around the world and actually made the universal advancement of human rights a priority.

● (1830)

Hon. Andrew Leslie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Canada-U.S. Relations), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off by saying that we thoroughly and completely condemn the appalling and inhumane actions of Daesh in Syria and Iraq. Its members have committed terrible atrocities against religious and ethnic communities and vulnerable populations in the region. This includes appalling levels of violence committed against Christians and Yazidis, Turkmen, Sabean-Mandaeans, Druze, Kurds, Shia and Sunni Arabs.

Christians are among those who, because of their smaller numbers, have borne a very heavy, indeed, a terrible and tragic burden. While many armed opposition groups in Syria have pledged to protect Syria's vulnerable religious and ethnic minorities, sectarian rhetoric has inspired incitement to hatred and violence against various religious and ethnic communities. We must take every step possible to ensure accountability for these crimes.

That is why Canada has formally requested the UN Security Council to establish a mechanism to investigate the potential violations of international law by Daesh. This includes the crime of genocide.

We have also provided $7.5 million to the Commission for International Justice and Accountability to investigate violations of international humanitarian law and criminal law in both Syria and Iraq.

Canada is also playing an important military role in fighting Daesh through our role in the global coalition. Our government has also welcomed vulnerable refugees from the region to Canada, as has already been mentioned by my hon. colleague. This is something that I know many Canadians are very proud of, and as a former soldier who has dedicated a portion of his life to fighting terrorism, I applaud this initiative.

Under our government, Canada will remain a partner to the people of the region who have suffered so needlessly and so tragically. That is why we are looking to help the future of the populations that have been affected. What matters to many now is how they can go about rebuilding their lives and their communities. Canada can and will play an important role in ensuring that vulnerable communities across Syria and Iraq, including Christians, are allowed to live in peace and security.

To this end, we are committing $840 million in humanitarian assistance to United Nations agencies. The International Committee of the Red Cross will also benefit from this as will international non-governmental organizations to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in Syria, Iraq and the region.

In 2017, with funding from Canada and other donors, humanitarian partners reached 5.3 million people in Syria with food assistance; 1.8 million people in Iraq with emergency water and sanitation activities; and over 4.5 million beneficiaries in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon and Jordan with sexual and reproductive health services.

By helping to address the underlying causes of the crisis in Syria and Iraq, and at the same time carrying the fight to Daesh through combat action and combat support, we will continue to contribute to the efforts to improve the security and rights of ordinary Iraqis and Syrians who are most affected.

We strongly believe that religious freedom is a vital and fundamental human right and one that should be strongly protected. That is why in July my colleague, the former parliamentary secretary, represented Canada at the first U.S.-sponsored ministerial to advance religious freedom. We joined 80 other countries in condemning the systemic ongoing egregious abuses of religious freedom perpetrated by terrorists and violent extremist groups, specifically Daesh.

Canada will continue to support all affected populations.

● (1835)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, with greatest respect, there are so many problems with what my colleague talked about. He spoke about accountability for crimes and yet to have meaningful accountability for crimes, we have to be willing to name the crime and we have to actually have a process that allows us to recognize the reality of that crime before the peak has long passed for the commission of that crime. At this point, so late in the process, we now hear the Liberals talking about wanting to start a study, yet what we need is clarity from the government about what has happened and the response.

Let me re-ask the question that I asked the Prime Minister, to which we still have not gotten an answer. The government has recognized not just the need for further study, but the obvious reality that a genocide was committed against Yazidi people. ISIS does not keep this a secret; it broadcasts this online. Given that this recognition has come from the government, will it also recognize the Christian victims of this genocide? Will it do that, yes or no?

Hon. Andrew Leslie: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I join every member in the House in condemning, without equivocation, the persecution and attacks by Daesh on the people of Syria and Iraq, including Christians, which of course includes the targeting of religious and ethnic minorities by Daesh and its agents. At the centre of our engagement in Syria and Iraq is the protection of human rights and providing assistance to those rebuilding their lives.

I have already listed the hundreds of millions of dollars that the people of Canada are contributing to aid those in pain and suffering in that region; as well, equally important and indeed more so, the hundreds of soldiers, airmen and airwomen we have committed to the fight.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:37 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, September 18, 2018

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Privacy Commissioner
The Speaker ... 21491

Committees of the House
Canadian Heritage
Ms. Dabrusin ... 21491
Procedure and House Affairs
Mr. Richards ... 21491
Motion for concurrence ... 21491
(Motion agreed to) ... 21491

Petitions
Visas
Mr. Tabbara ... 21491
Election Observation Missions
Mr. Bezan ... 21491
Justice
Mr. Bezan ... 21491
Cemetery Reconsecration
Mr. Bezan ... 21492
Children's Welfare
Mr. Julian ... 21492
National Parks
Mr. Eglinski ... 21492
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Eglinski ... 21492
Canada Post
Ms. Mathyssen ... 21492
The Environment
Ms. Mathyssen ... 21492
Pipelines
Mr. Genuis ... 21492
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Genuis ... 21493
The Environment
Mr. Johns ... 21493
Children's Welfare
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 21493
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Viersen ... 21493
Indigenous Affairs
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 21493
Children's Welfare
Mr. Stetski ... 21493
Ms. Moore ... 21493
Ms. Kwan ... 21493

Questions on the Order Paper
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21493

Request for Emergency Debate
Trans Mountain Expansion Project
Mrs. Stubbs ... 21494

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership Implementation Act
Bill C-79—Time Allocation Motion
Ms. Chagger ... 21494
Motion ... 21494
Motion agreed to ... 21496
Second Reading
Bill C-79, Second reading ... 21496
Mr. Boissonnault ... 21496
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 21497
Mr. Samson ... 21498
Mr. Berthold ... 21498
Ms. Lapointe ... 21498
Mr. Donnelly ... 21499
Mr. Genuis ... 21499
Ms. Kwan ... 21500
Mr. Berthold ... 21500
Mr. Samson ... 21501
Ms. Kwan ... 21502
Mr. Barlow ... 21502
Mr. Genuis ... 21502
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21503
Mr. Johns ... 21504
Mr. Deltell ... 21504
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones ... 21504
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 21505
Mr. Stetski ... 21505
Ms. Lapointe ... 21505
Mr. Johns ... 21505
Mr. Ouellette ... 21506
Mr. Johns ... 21507
Mr. Samson ... 21508
Ms. Brosseau ... 21508
Ms. Lapointe ... 21509
Mr. Ste-Marie ... 21510
Mr. Davies ... 21510
Ms. Lapointe ... 21512
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21512
Mr. Ste-Marie ... 21513
Ms. Lapointe ... 21514
Mr. Marcil ... 21514
Mr. Johns ... 21515
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 21515
Mr. Longfield ... 21517
Mr. O'Toole ... 21517
Mr. Fonseca ... 21517
Ms. Quach ... 21519
Mr. Gerretsen ... 21519
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 21519

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Justice
Mr. Thériault 21520

Community Champions
Mr. McKinnon 21520

Bob Porter
Mr. Motz 21520

Bagotville Cadets
Mr. Robillard 21520

Justice
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) 21520

Government Performance
Ms. Ratansi 21521

Gordon Young
Mr. Nater 21521

Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville Arts Circuit
Mr. Picard 21521

Coptic Orthodox Priest's 40th Anniversary
Mr. Alghabra 21521

Horatio Alger Association Scholarships
Mr. Poilievre 21521

Infrastructure
Mrs. Fortier 21522

Yom Kippur
Mr. Housefather 21522

World Marrow Donor Day
Mr. Scheer 21522

Methamphetamine Abuse
Mr. Eyolfson 21522

Young Farmers
Ms. Moore 21523

Chicoutimi—Le Fjord
Mr. Martel 21523

Urban Transit
Mr. Fergus 21523

ORAL QUESTIONS

Steel Industry
Mr. Scheer 21523
Mr. Trudeau 21523

Natural Resources
Mr. Scheer 21523
Mr. Trudeau 21524
Mr. Scheer 21524
Mr. Trudeau 21524
Mr. Scheer 21524
Mr. Trudeau 21524

Carbon Pricing
Mr. Scheer 21524
Mr. Trudeau 21524

International Trade
Mr. Caron 21524
Mr. Trudeau 21524
Mr. Caron 21525
Mr. Trudeau 21525
Ms. Ramsey 21525
Mr. Trudeau 21525
Ms. Ramsey 21525
Mr. Trudeau 21525

Marijuana
Mr. Rayes 21525
Mr. Blair 21525
Mr. Rayes 21525
Mr. Blair 21526

Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship
Mr. Paul-Hus 21526
Mr. Blair 21526
Mr. Paul-Hus 21526
Mr. LeBlanc 21526
Ms. Rempel 21526
Mr. Hussen 21526
Ms. Rempel 21526
Mr. Hussen 21527

Natural Resources
Mr. Boulerice 21527
Mr. Morneau 21527
Mr. Boulerice 21527
Mr. Morneau 21527
Mrs. Stubbs 21527
Mr. Sohi 21527
Mrs. Stubbs 21527
Mr. Sohi 21528
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) 21528
Mr. Sohi 21528
Mr. Schmale 21528
Mr. Bains 21528
Ms. Malcolmson 21528
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) 21528

Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Donnelly 21528
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown) 21528

Official Languages
Mr. Samson 21529
Ms. Joly 21529

Carbon Pricing
Mrs. Block 21529
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) 21529
Mr. Deltell 21529
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) 21529
Mr. Poilievre 21529
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) 21529

Taxation
Mr. Poilievre 21530
Mr. Morneau 21530

Veterans Affairs
Mr. Johns ... 21530
Mr. O'Regan ... 21530

Persons with Disabilities
Ms. Hardcastle ... 21530
Ms. Qualtrough ... 21530

Ethics
Mr. Doherty ... 21530
Mr. LeBlanc ... 21530
Mr. Kent ... 21531
Ms. Gould ... 21531
Mr. Gourde ... 21531
Ms. Gould ... 21531

Seniors
Ms. Rudd ... 21531
Ms. Tassi ... 21531

Labour
Mrs. Gallant ... 21531
Mr. Cuzner ... 21531

Health
Ms. Quach ... 21531
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 21532

International Trade
Ms. Ludwig ... 21532
Mr. Carr ... 21532

Public Services and Procurement
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 21532
Mr. Sajjan ... 21532
Mrs. Gill ... 21532
Ms. Qualtrough ... 21532
Mr. Plamondon ... 21532
Ms. Qualtrough ... 21532

Natural Resources
Mr. Barsalou-Duval ... 21532
Mr. Morneau ... 21533

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership Implementation Act
Bill C-79. Second reading ... 21533
Mr. O'Toole ... 21533
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 21534
Ms. Ramsey ... 21535
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21535
Mr. Genuis ... 21536
Mr. Nantel ... 21536
Mr. Nater ... 21537
Mr. Vaughan ... 21538
Ms. Ramsey ... 21538
Mr. Hoback ... 21539
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 21540
Ms. Ramsey ... 21541
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 21541
Ms. Ramsey ... 21542
Mr. Gerretsen ... 21543
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) ... 21543
Mr. Gerretsen ... 21545
Mr. Aboultaif ... 21545
Mr. McDonald ... 21545
Mr. Barlow ... 21545
Mr. Alghabra ... 21547
Mr. Boulerice ... 21547
Mr. Calkins ... 21547
Mr. Obhrai ... 21548
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21549
Mr. Nantel ... 21549
Mr. Saroya ... 21549
Motion negatived ... 21551
Motion agreed to ... 21552
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ... 21552

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code
Bill C-375. Report Stage ... 21552
Mr. Jowhari ... 21552
Motion for concurrence ... 21552
Division on motion deferred ... 21552

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Status of Women
Ms. Malcolmson ... 21553
Mr. Duguid ... 21553

The Environment
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 21554
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) ... 21555

Foreign Affairs
Mr. Genuis ... 21556
Mr. Leslie ... 21556

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca